
An Advertisement.

WHen the late *Answer to the Bishop of Meaux* came forth, this was just finished; but laid by as useless, till upon an after View it was thought it might be serviceable; because of a more particular Explication of the Church of England's Sentiments in it, and likewise a more full Expression of the Romish Doctrines from the Publick Acts of that Church, and its direct answering M. Condom's Reasons, which the other Author does not propose to himself.

An Advertisement.

WHen the late Answer to the Bishop of Meaux came forth, this was just finished; but laid by as useless, till upon an after View it was thought it might be serviceable; because of a more particular Explication of the Church of England's Sentiments in it, and likewise a more full Expression of the Romish Doctrines from the Publick Acts of that Church, and its direct answering M. Condom's Reasons, which the other Author does not propose to himself.

AN
ANSWER
TO THE
Bishop of Condom
(Now of MEAUX)

His Exposition of the Catholick Faith, &c.

Wherein the DOCTRINE of the

Church of Rome
Is DETECTED,

And that of the

Church of England

EXPRESSED,

FROM THE

Publick Acts of both CHURCHES.

John

To which are added,

Gilbert A. M.

Reflections on his Pastoral Letter.

John Gilbert

LONDON: *ih*

Printed by H. C. for R. Kettlewell and R. Wells, at the Hand and
Scepter against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet street. 1686.

Imprimatur,

Guil. Needham R^{mo}. in Christo
Patri ac D. D. *Wilhelmo*
Archi-Ep. *Cantuar.* a Sacr.
Domest.

Ex Edib. Lambeth.
Jan. 4. 1686.

THE PREFACE.

HIM, that shall think fit to answer this Treatise, *M. Condom* desires, *pag. 51.* to consider, that to accomplish his intent,

“ 1st. He must not undertake to refute the “ Doctrine contained in it, it not being his design to “ prove, but only to propose it in this Book. But I hope if in pursuing the design of his Book, in some places I observe the falshood or danger of some of these Doctrins, or the insufficiency of his Reasons given to establish them, it may be allowed; especially if they are but such hints as are as necessary for the subverting the Design of the Treatise, as his Reasons given to establish the Doctrine are for the explication of it.

“ 2^{ly}. That it would be a quitting the design of this “ Treatise to examine the different Methods, which “ *Catholick* Divines have used to explicate the Doctrine “ of the Council of *Trent*, and the different consequences which particular Doctors have drawn from “ it. But with his leave, if himself be no other than a Particular Doctor, (for we can allow him to be no more as yet, till those Approbations collected in the Advertisement from several of the most principal Divines and others in the Church, and at last from

B

the

The Preface.

the *Pope* himself, which are pleaded for his greater authority, come to be considered) it can be no quitting the design of his Book (if any part of it be the Exposition of the Doctrine of that Council) to take notice, if there be occasion, of any different Explication, which others have given of it. For though their Explication being different, does not prove his not to be contained in it; yet first it assures us, that the words which are used by the Council to express its Doctrine are ambiguous, since different explications pretend equally to be explications of the Council. And thereby 2^{ly}. we are left uncertain in what sense the Church holds the Doctrine; which we have no reason to take from him, unless upon examination it shall hereafter appear, that he has a greater authority to declare the sense held by the Church, than the other had.

“ 3^{ly}. That to urge any thing solid against this Book, and which may come home to the Point, it must be proved, That the Churches Faith is not here faithfully expounded, and that by Acts which the Church has obliged her self to receive. This last clause may either plead for my proving, that he himself has not expounded it faithfully by such Acts; or that my proof of the falsity of his Exposition must in all things be made out by such Acts. In the former case I shall hold my self obliged when I oppose him to do it from those Acts produced by himself, or others as much owned by the Church. In the latter, presumptive proofs, that conclude with greater probability for the falshood, than his for the truth of his Exposition, are the utmost that ought to be required; there being no reason, that he should oblige me to proofs of another nature than what he brings himself.

“ Or else, 4^{ly}. That it must be shewn, that this Explication leaves all the Objections in their full force, and all the Disputes untouched. Herein I shall be especially careful, since he has expressly obliged me to it, to consider what Objections are in force, and what Disputes remain.

“ 5^{ly}. Or

The Preface.

“ 5^{ly}. Or in fine, It must be precisely shewn in what this Doctrine subverts the foundations of Faith. Of this likewise I shall be careful, but suppose in some cases it appear, that in all probability, though not precisely, it subverts the Faith ; certainly a Church that ought to provide for the preservation, cannot justify her self in commanding things that in every mans judgment tend to the destruction of the Faith : and if it appear, that this Doctrine does, and experience testify it has, greatly prejudiced the foundations of Faith ; shall the whole world be obliged to forbear providing for their common Christianity, till all its Foundations be totally overthrown ?

The Author, though he seems to acquaint us with his design, yet has not positively express'd the end he aims at : but so far as I can dive into it, it is this. 1st. To take off that false *Idea* which *Protestants* have framed to themselves, of the Church of *Rome* : for such he takes notice they have, p. 1. upon which he thinks it beneficial to explicate to them what the Church has defined in the *Trent* Council upon the main Points in controversy. And thereby, 2^{ly}. to gain a good opinion in the Reformers of the Churches innocence. 3^{ly}. By this explication of their Doctrine to shew that the main Disputes are not so material as they have been thought, and that many of them are at an end. 4^{ly}. That the Matters from which the first grounds of Separation were taken, by this Explication being cleared, and appearing not so ill as they have been judged, they are no longer justifiable Causes of a Separation, whereby we are concluded under a necessity of joining with the Church of *Rome*.

The first of these he intimates as his aim, when he tells us, he had observed many had a false *Idea* of their Church, whereupon he took a resolution to explicate their Doctrine, p. 1. The third and fourth are implied in the two effects proposed to himself from this Exposition, p. 2. The conclusion, that our distance is no longer justifiable, is not positively inferred by M. *Condom* : But

The Preface.

Ado. p. 9.

the Advertisement as it sometimes calls for the Removal of our false Conceptions, sometimes for a better opinion of the Church, sometimes challenges that an end is put to the main Disputes, does also in this clearly discover it self and tell us, " That we may hereupon be justly afraid " to persist in a Schism, which is manifestly founded upon " false Principles even in the most principal Points.

Now no man will oppose the first intent, it being most just, that every man be willing to lay aside his false or prejudicate Opinions. Nor the second for the same reason, any further, than to prevent the *swallow* of their Errors with this bait. What I intend is to evidence, that there are Matters of that weight in controversie, notwithstanding the pretence of this Book to have discussed and answered the most material; as will abundantly justify the Reformed in their distance from the Church of *Rome*, and which is more, conclude them under a necessity of maintaining that distance, as things now stand.

THE

T H E
A D V E R T I S E M E N T
T O T H E
Bishop of *Condom's* Book Considered.

“ T H E Advertisement begins with a Supposition,
“ which it thinks we must necessarily allow ; That
“ M. *Condom* has faithfully expounded the Doctrine
“ of the Church of *Rome* in this Treatise, from his
“ being a Bishop in the Church ; whose Understanding there-
“ fore and Sincerity ought not to be suspected ; and after-
“ wards, from his being called to be *Præceptor* to the *Dauphin*,
“ Son to so great a King, and Defender of the *Catholick Re-*
“ *ligion*. But yet he tells us, Though the sincerer part of
“ the Reformed acknowledged it would take away great Diffi-
“ culties if approved and owned for their Doctrine ; yet they
“ would never believe it such, or that it would be approved
“ at *Rome*, being prepossessed with Prejudice and false Opinion.

But without reflecting either upon the Bishop's Understanding or Sincerity, we have a great deal of reason to expect he shew us an Authority that warrants him to give us this Exposition, and declare it to us as the faithful and true Sense, and only Doctrine of the Church ; since the Pope hath peremptorily forbidden all Prelates of whatever Order, Condition or Degree, to set forth any Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Trent-Council*, reserving it to the *Apostolical See*: Setting then his Authority as questionable for the present, aside, I am no more convinced by the Nature of the Exposition, that it is the genuine Sense of the Church of *Rome*, in all points, than those who first saw the Book : Whether it be Prejudice or Prepossession, that blinds my Understanding, will not appear till after the Discussion of Particulars.

*Bulla Pii quartii
super Confirm.
Concil. Trid.*

Pag.

" *Pag. 2.* He tells us of two Answers to this Treatise, and
 " that both of them agreed in questioning *M. Condom's* Autho-
 " rity to expound the Council, and that his Exposition agrees
 " not with the Decisions of the Council, nor with their Pro-
 " fession of Faith. Concerning these things I shall determine
 nothing till I come to the Particulars.

But whereas he saies, *Pag. 3.* " That one of them has drawn
 " a wrong Conclusion from those Softnings of *M. Condom*, to
 " confirm themselves in a better Opinion of the Reformation. I
 do not think the Inference altogether so absurd as the Advertizer
 pretends it ; for do not they in a great measure justify the Re-
 formed, who call for the Reformation of those Abuses which the
 Church of *Rome* herself pretends to condemn, but will not, or
 has not rectified ?

The next Thing it endeavors is to prove, *p. 4.* " That this Ex-
 " position of *M. Condom's* is the true Sense of the Church ; which
 " is grounded, first, upon the general Approbation his Book re-
 " ceived throughout the whole Church, testified by Letters
 " from all sorts of People, not in *France* only, but at *Rome*, espe-
 " cially in Eight Letters concerning it from Cardinals, and others
 " of great Merit.

But, taking it for granted, without any further Examination,
 That all these Men, by their Approbations of this Book, do
 consent that this Exposition is the true Sense of the Church,
 (which is more than need be granted, since some only say it is a
 Method very ingenious and good to force the *Calvinists* to con-
 fess the Catholick Faith) yet this will not suffice, where there are
 so many Writers of as great Authority and Eminence in the
 Church, as any of these, that have, though not perhaps un-
 dertook to expound the *Council*, as this Author ; yet to declare
 and defend a Doctrine much different from this, from the same
Council, and in behalf of the same Church : And suppose the
 Number that approved it, great, yet Cardinal *Bona's* Letter
 informs us, that some found fault with it ; and those he must
 mean, of their own Church, when he gives this Reason that he
 does not wonder at it ; *Because all Works great, and above the*
common Level, find Persons still to contradict them. And be the
 Number what it will, I suppose he will not, as it is not rea-
 sonable, seek for the Churches Doctrine by counting Noses.

Then for the Letter of Cardinal *Sigismond*, which says
 " the Advertizer, shews how ill grounded that Scruple is against
 " this Exposition from the Pope's Prohibition to explicate the
 " Council.

To

To me it rather shews how well it is grounded ; for his Words are, " Certainly it was never his intention to give the " interpretation of the Tenets of the Council, but only to deliver them in his Book rightly explicated, in such sort that " Hereticks may be convinced ; and especially in those things " which the holy Church obliges them to believe. Which, if it signifie any thing, must be, That his Exposition is not an interpretation of the Council, obliging any to believe it as Matter of Faith, but a Design of explicating it in such sort as he judged useful for convincing Hereticks.

But if this will not content, we have an Approbation from the Pope himself ; after which, 'twas needless to mention others, says the Advertizer ; and let me add , without which his others signifie little to his Point. The Gentleman calls it " a *Breve*, " wherein the Pope gives his Approbation, and that so-express, " as to leave no further doubt, and in the most authentick manner that could be expected.

I have considered it, and yet my Doubt is not vanished ; and when the least that could have been expected in reason, on Account of the difficulty of believing it , express'd by the Reformed five or six years before the Date of this *Breve* from the Pope ; as also from the Nature of the thing, which being an exposition of Faith, ought to be so received by all, that not one man hold Tenets different from it ; as also from the former Pope's Prohibition of all Explication of this Council, is that the Pope should have declared, that this Exposition did perfectly contain the true and whole Faith of the Church in the Points expounded, and that it should be lookt upon as authentick as if made by the Apostolick See it self : We may have that Charity for the Advertizer, as to think its his good desire to have it made authentick, that makes him look upon it as such, and suppress all his Doubts : But we who desire no less than he, that it were so, have yet some peculiar Reasons to see to our selves that we are not imposed on , and therefore to examine what Authority this Approbation gives it.

All which the Pope here saies to approve it , is no more than this ; " That it contains such Doctrine, and is composed in such " a Method, and with so much Prudence, that it is thereby rendered proper to instruct, and to extort even from the unwilling, a Confession of the Catholick Faith ; but he does not in all this say, that it is the true and only Sense of the Council. And further, " That for these Reasons he does not only think " it worthy his Commendation, but to be read and esteemed by " all.

"all. He does not say nor mean *esteemed* for the only Sense of the Council; as is plain by the *Latine* Copy. And further, "We hope this Work by the Grace of God will bring forth "much Fruit, and will not a little help to propagate the Orthodox Faith.

In all which, he neither declares it for the Sense of the Council, nor confirms it as such, nor does any thing to make it authentick; if that be to authorize it as a Truth, throughout the whole Church; which yet is the least that could be lookt for in this Case, for the Reasons given. The utmost therefore that can be made of it, is only, that it has the commendation of his private Judgment for a prudent, useful, good Book, likely to work no small Effects for the propagation of the Catholick Faith: So that this will be no great prejudice to any Proofs that shall be made against *M. Condom*, where I may attempt, in opposition to him, to shew, that he has not fully given the Doctrine of his Church.

But the Advertizer raising himself on this Foundation, that "this Exposition is as true and as authentick as he pretends it, "and laying on this Presumption further, that it has most effectually served the Ends it aims at; insults over the Reformed as if the Day was clearly gained; boasting the pretended Victory not over the Answerers only, but all Reformers.

What particular Advantages he pretends over the Answerers, I meddle not with (wanting both opportunity to procure, and capacity to understand their Books, if *French*) nor will I be obliged to concern my self with any pretended to be gotten over any Numbers of the Reformed, either for their false Opinions, Doctrines or Concessions, in any Cases, but where the like may seem pretended from like Doctrines or Concessions of the Church of *England*.

Whether he has such real Cause to Boast, will not appear till the End: But what of his is added to back *M. Condom*, shall be considered under their particular Heads in the Exposition.

Pag. 18. He goes on to vindicate *M. Condom*. First, That "he has done well to propose the true Tenets of the Council, "and their Church, and distinguish them from those that are "falsly imputed to her.

No body will blame his Aim in this; God forbid that any should refuse to hear what may inform them, and remove their Prejudices.

Secondly, "That he has done but just in taking the Doctrine "of the Church from the Council of *Trem*. Nor will any blame

blame him for this, or require him to justify the Council from the great suspicions that are justly had of it, for be the Council what it will, it's sufficient for the Exposition, that the Doctrine of it is universally received throughout their Church. Nor shall Father *Paul's* History, because he here is said to be a profess'd enemy to the Council of *Trent*, either prejudice me against its Doctrines, or make me call its Decisions ambiguous, without apparent grounds for it.

Thirdly, "That his choice was not amiss in pitching upon those Points from which the subject of the Reformation was taken. But however, if new Matters have been added by themselves since, which make the distance wider, those may well be added as Obstacles to a present Union: and without reflecting on the Bishops sincerity, or accusing him to have on purpose left out the greatest difficulties, it may be allowed me to produce others so far as they are material to shew that some great Objections are yet in force, and many great Disputes untouched. But whether he has been so faithful to his promise, as to affirm nothing to make the Council better understood, which is not approved of in the Church, and manifestly conformable to it, will appear when the particulars are examined.

There is one thing more that will greatly affect me as well as the other Answerers, against whom it's urged, p. 23. "That it's to no purpose to object against this Exposition, the Bull of *Pius* the Fourth, for that the design of this Book (says the Advertiser) has nothing of those Glosses and Commentaries, which with great reason that *Pope* condemned; some of which usually fill'd the Margins with their own Imaginations, and gave them for the Text it self, and such, for the conservation of Unity, the *Pope* was obliged not to permit, nothing of which nature is in this Exposition. But he need not have taken all this pains, if himself durst have relied on his former proof of its authentickness: yet to make this of any strength, to back what he had said before, he should have told us by what authority he declares what sort of Comments and Glosses the *Pope* forbids in that Bull, or the Reasons upon which he did it: Let this be one reason; yet what shall hinder but Father *Paul's* may be another, that it was to withstand the checks which the Council might be said to give to the Papal power, and disable all from using it to the prejudice of the Court of *Rome*? To believe which we have greater grounds than Father *Paul's* bare assertion: but much less to believe the Advertiser, since the Bull in express words forbids, not only such Interpretations, as Comments and Glosses, but all Annotations,

C

"Scho-

“*Scholias*, and every kind of interpretation whatsoever: decreeing likewise all such as any should attempt to make wittingly or ignorantly with or by whatsoever authority void and null.

Whereas in the conclusion, p. 24. he says, “That suppose we call for the Reformation of Abuses, it is one way of suppressing them to shew the Truth in purity, not excluding other means. I shall here take occasion to remember out of M. *Verone*, in his Epitome of his Methods, (part of whose method M. *Condom* exactly follows) how little we can propose to our selves from these fair pretences of representing the truth in purity towards this effect: which will also shew in part upon what grounds this Doctrine of the Exposition may find that approbation which it has amongst them, and yet be far from being so truly and universally received, as is pretended. This M. *Verone* is most eminent for the use of this Method, to separate the Decrees of the Council from the Opinions of all particular persons whatsoever, and the Doctrine he would perswade as the Churches sense seems in all things as moderate as this of M. *Condom*. He says, they do no further honor Images than as they use outward respect to the Bible and other sacred Utensils, and speaks of Transubstantiation, Merits, &c. much after the same moderation, and will not have the Infallibility of the *Pope* to be matter of the Catholick Faith. And yet this Person, though he declares the Doctrine of their Church in a way fair to appearance, tells us nevertheless, that what other Doctors have said of the Popes Infallibility, and his being the only Judge of Controversies, is true, p. 410. and that himself does hold them as truths, *de Fide*, p. 425. He tells us likewise in the Chapter entitled, *Calumniæ eluta*, That some, not of the unlearned only, but learned too, had clancularly aspersed him, as if he had said it was not matter of Faith, That the Church could not err; That she was not the supream and only Judge; That the *Pope* was not Head of the Church; That he sought the union of Religion by remitting part of the Faith. The cry of this was so great, that he tells us he set forth a publick *Programma* in his own vindication, wherein he declares his assent to those things which he was supposed to have denied, and says they are *Veritates Fidei*, Truths belonging to the Faith, though not defined by the Council *Ipsissimis terminis*: and that he did not intend by any of his Explications any such diminution of their Faith, as his accusers mistook him to intend, but only used this as a necessary method to reduce such as were gon astray. He often taxes them to shew wherein he had expressly impugned those Truths which they thought him

Verone's Epit.
b. *Convin.*
1. *ret.*

to

to have betray'd, and tells them their oversight lay in this, that when he said such and such Truths were not *de fide Catholica*, they mistook him, as though he had denied them to be necessary Truths, which he denies himself to have the least implied, and declares his own belief of the *Popes* Infallibility; adding withal, that the Explication which he had given of himself, in this instance, he would have understood with respect to all the Matters he had handled, as Transubstantiation, Merits, Images, Adoration of the Eucharist, &c. This he look'd upon, he tells us, p. 315. as the most expedient Method to propose only those Doctrines which the Council expressly commanded to be held, and pass the rest in silence, when they expect to win Runnagates to the Faith, whom if they can bring first to the admission of this, there will be opportunity gained to prevail with them in the rest.

I will not take the advantage given me by this mans fraud, to accuse M. *Condom* of the like; but only infer in part from hence, that the Doctrine of this Exposition, which differs not from *Verone's*, has been look'd on with a jealous eye among themselves, whatever approbation it may have now; and again, that the Gentlemen have no reason to be angry, since themselves have made the detection, if we fear to swallow a bait that may conceal a hook.

What was done to remedy those Abuses, which were in vain complained of, will be better justifiable, after examination of the particulars, when we shall be capable to consider on whom the Schism and the miseries consequent upon it may be most justly charged.

I thank the Advertiser, that he forbears reproaches, though he says he could find ground enough for them in abuses that are among us; for which, although I hope he could find but few, yet I shall hold myself indebted to him the forbearance of all Invectives, and the silence of those Abuses which shall any way appear to be disallowed by their Church.

I likewise beg of God that they may read without bitterness, and may that God from whom alone is all success, who knows the progress of Error, and its increase, through mens making his Religion subservient to their own ambition, intrests, and hypocrisies, so effectually touch the hearts of all, that all parties may act and with their utmost strength endeavour all which true sincere Piety and a zeal for God and his glory, free from all other ends and intrests, does oblige them to for healing the Wounds of his afflicted Church.

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

Late Bishop of *Condom's* BOOK,

ENTITLED,

*An Exposition of the Catholick Faith in
Matters of Controversie.*

S E C T. I

The Design of his Treatise considered.

AS to this first Section, wherein he mentions his Design, having considered it in part already, I have little more to add. I confess it very expedient to consider the Grounds of the first Separation, and the necessity of a Right Explication of their Churches Tenents and that these ought to be taken from the publick Acts of the Church, and not from particular Doctors, for the reason quoted out of *M. Daille*, That the sentiments of particular persons ought not to be imputed to the whole body: only here is one thing wanting which we desire might be declared, that all Tenents of particular Doctors, contrary to any of this which shall be delivered as the sense of the Church, are false and disowned by it: for to say it is implied is not sufficient, when a Church pretends to declare her self to her Adversaries, who charge her with other Doctrines maintained by her.

But for what he adds from *Mr. Daille*, “ That no separation
“ ought

“ ought to be but upon the account of Articles authentickly established to the belief and observance of which all persons are obliged. I must here observe, That this Concession does not affect the Church of *England*, till it be proved, that by Reforming her self she has departed either from the true Faith, or from some authority to which she was lawfully subject; not that I hold National Churches less obliged to preserve the unity of the whole, than every particular member that of the Church where-in he lives: but that I maintain a Church, that is not dependent upon others, can never be said to have done any thing to prejudice the unity of the Catholick Church, by reforming abuses within her self, and taking the best expedients to preserve the foundations of Faith and promote good life, *so that all things be done to edifying*; as it is expres’d by the Church of *England*, *Artic. 34.*

39 Artic. of
the Church of
England.

Whereas he says, that what he writes shall be approved of in the Church, and be conformable to the Doctrine of the Council; I could wish he had promised, that it should be the true and only Sense of the Council, and that it should likewise be the whole Doctrine of the Church in the Particulars he treats of.

Another thing is necessary for me to premise here, that what Advantages he may take from the Principles of some Reformists in these Disputes, I think my self not much concerned in, having declared that I will oblige my self only to the Consequences that may be drawn from the Principles of the Church of *England*.

S E C T. II.

Concerning the Church of Rome's embracing all the Fundamentals of Religion.

THIS Section premiseth, That the Church of *Rome* believes and professes all the Fundamental Articles of Faith; particularly, those in the Apostles Creed: which we are so far from denying, that we plead and challenge it, being sure it will give us this Advantage, that they can never charge us with Innovation, nor with departure from the Faith, if these are all the Fundamental and Principal Articles.

“ But M. *Condom* pretends that they also can draw from hence great Advantages, which we seek to deprive them of, by
“ saying

“saying they destroy those Articles by interposing others contrary to them. Thus much is said, and yet is more than need be said; for if we say only, that they have added others to them, which are not necessary parts of Faith, this alone is enough to bar them all Advantages which they may promise themselves from holding the Fundamentals.

But M. *Condom* foreseeing that it would be urged against him, that those Doctrines, which the Church of *Rome* hath added to the Faith, do by evident consequence destroy those which it acknowledges as the necessary and fundamental Truths; endeavours to prevent us this Advantage, by objecting, “That M. *Daille* has owned in behalf of the *Lutherans*, and it is a “thing in it self evident, that the Consequences of a Doctrine “ought not to be attributed to a Church that formally rejects “those Consequences; which Answer he concludes will easily “defend them, when they are charged with Consequences destructive of the Truth. I likewise own the Maxime so far as it is grounded upon Reason: but in Reason we ought to distinguish between the Persons that own such Consequences, and those who do not: Which Distinction will enforce at least thus much; that we who, being separate from the Church of *Rome*, do evidently see such Consequences naturally following any of their Doctrines, can never with safety receive them: For though we should grant those Consequences which the Church of *Rome* rejects, are not to be charged upon her; yet it were to be granted only upon this very reason that she professes not to see them, and she were to be allowed innocent only so far as she sees them not. So that the self same Reason that would exempt her from the Charge, would bring us deeply under it, if acknowledging of such Consequences, we should embrace the Doctrines whence they flow; and the Church of *Rome* is therefore utterly inexcusable in enjoining such things on those who profess they see such Consequences in them as destroy the Faith, and is less excusable in its own holding them, the greater Means and Opportunities she has had to discern their pernicious Effects.

Again, Reason does oblige us to distinguish between Consequences which are only Inferences that may be drawn by remote Arguments from an Opinion, and such as have a real Influence upon our Practice. An Instance will explain my Meaning: Suppose for the present, the Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone did by consequence infer good Works unnecessary; he ought not to be charged with this Consequence who disowns it,

it, and disowning it, shews that he thinks them necessary, and therefore does them: But if any holding this Opinion, should neglect them out of a dependance on his being justified without them, I do not think *M. Condom* would account it Calumny to charge him with the Consequence.

And therefore the Reason *M. Daille* gives, upon which they refused not to joyn Communion with the *Lutherans*, because their Opinion *has no Poyson* in it, is not so contemptible; for they who joyned Communion with them, joyned not in their Error, nor in any evil Practice consequent upon it. And be Christ's humane Nature never so essential to Religion, yet the *Lutheran* Opinion did never cause them to deny the verity of his humane Nature, nor reach to what the Church of *Rome* does, whilst it commands the Worship of that which we cannot think a lawful Object for us to give it to. So that perhaps it may be a greater difficulty to defend the Church of *Rome* in this respect, than *M. Condom* is willing to believe.

But this Gentleman has put us to a needless trouble hitherto, if he make good his further Promise, and shew by his Exposition that the Church of *Rome* is so far from ruining the fundamental Articles of Faith, either directly or indirectly, that on the contrary she establishes them after so solid and evident a manner, that no one can question her right understanding them, without great Injustice: I hope he means such a right understanding them, as that she holds nothing directly or indirectly prejudicial to them; and hereupon I shall go on with him to the Particulars.

S E C T. III.

Concerning Religious Worship as due to God alone.

M*R. Condom's* Title of this Section is, *Religious Worship is terminated in God alone*: But if he had said, *it is due to God alone*, it had been more consistent with his first Article, that he is pleased to own for Fundamental, *Self. 2.*

“ But that Adoration which is due to God alone (he says) the
 “ Church of *Rome* teaches to consist in believing him to be the
 “ Creator and Lord of all things, and in adhering to him with
 “ all the powers of our Soul, by Faith, Hope and Charity, as
 “ to him alone who can render us happy by the communication
 “ of

“ of an infinite Good, which is himself. The Church of *England* teaches and challenges the same, as a Truth that indispensably binds us to have recourse in all our Necessities to him alone, who is the Creator and Lord of all things, to adhere to him alone with all the powers of our Soul, without dividing our Hearts to any other; to place our Hope and Confidence in him only, who is that infinite and eternal Good which alone can satisfie us; to love him above all things who hath first loved us with a Love so far passing all understanding; out of which Love he hath created, redeemed, preserves us, and hath provided such Rewards for them that love him.

“ This interior Adoration (he says) has its exterior Marks, “ of which, the principal is Sacrifice; which cannot be offered “ to any but God; because a Sacrifice is established to make a “ publick Acknowledgment and a solemn Protestation of God’s “ Sovereignty, and our absolute Dependance. Granting but this true, that this internal Adoration has some exterior Marks, as Sacrifice (for instance) which cannot be given but to God alone; it will be very difficult, in my Judgment, to prove, that Invocation, Prostration, or any other exterior Forms of Adoration, which are commonly used in Religious Worship, are not thus peculiar to God alone. For if the Reason why Sacrifice is thus peculiar to him, be this, its being established to make a publick Acknowledgment and solemn Protestation of God’s Sovereignty, and our absolute Dependance; since he cannot argue it thus peculiar barely from God’s establishment of it, Sacrifice being the exterior part of his Worship before the Law of *Moses*, and doubtless as much his Peculiar then as after; so that it depends upon the Reason of its establishment, which indeed is solid, its having been used and determined by the practice of the whole World for a publick Acknowledgment of God’s Sovereignty, &c. This will conclude no less for any external Signs of Adoration used and determined by the like universal consent and practice, to express the same Sentiment, and declare the like Dependance. For though external Actions signify as the inward Sentiments determine them; yet in all reason general Use and Custom ought to determine them beyond the Sentiments of private men; and whatever that shall have determined to be given to God as Signs and Acknowledgments of the Worship due unto him alone, I cannot see how it can be lawful for any upon private Sentiments to direct to another signification, especially in actions of Religious Worship; since by so doing, they not only scandalize and give offence to all those who have
appro-

appropriated and determined those external Characters to express this Acknowledgment they make to God; but do interpretatively also rob God of his Honour, whilst they appear to men to give those Expressions of Honour to others, which the rest of the World have determined to this peculiar purpose of expressing their Acknowledgments of that Honour which is God's incommunicable Right. Nor will it avail much to say such Tokens may be and are used for Civil Purposes in the Honour of Superiors, or the like; for the only reason why they may be so, is because they are so, and to that determined by consent and practice, as universal as that which has appropriated them to Religious Worship, so that hereby Offence is neither given nor taken, because all consent; neither can it interpretatively tend to the diminution of God's Honour, because all men know them to express a different intent; which cannot be so distinctly known when they are used in the way of Religious Worship, of which God only is by the whole World look'd on as the proper Object.

M. *Condom* goes on, saying, "The Church of *Rome* teaches us, "that all Religious Worship ought to terminate in God as its necessary end. But we say, it ought to be given only to him as its necessary and immediate object, and upon this point moves the principal difficulty.

Again, (he says,) "That if the Honour which he renders to "the blessed Virgin and to the Saints may in some sense be called "Religious, it is for its necessary relation to God. But we say, if in any sense it be Religious, That they have chosen a wrong object, and that the Honour of the Virgin and the Saints has no such necessary relation to God's Honour as can oblige us to give them any Religious Worship: That therefore, if they have made the Honour of these necessary to God's Honour, it is without warrant, that likewise, if in their own intentions they direct the Honour given to these to terminate in God as its necessary end, it is not enough to justify them, that they intend and direct that to him which he has not required, especially if this has or may tend to the diminution of that which he does require.

But, in our way to the particulars, we meet an observation which M. *Condom* makes, as very useful for his purpose, viz. "That "those of the Reformation (oblig'd by the strength of truth) "begin to acknowledge, that the custom of Praying to Saints, and "Honouring their Relicks, was established even in the Fourth "Age of the Church. That it was established, is more than any acknowledge that I know of; that something of this nature was in

use at that time has been ever acknowledged: But if he (obliged by the strength of truth) will acknowledg it not to have been in use before, we shall not envy him the best advantages he can make of it. "M. Daille (says he) grants thus much in his "Book against the Tradition of the *Latin Church* about the object of Religious Worship, and accuses St. *Basil*, *Ambrose*, *Hierome*, *Chrysostome*, *Augustin*, and especially *Nazianzen* of having altered in this point the Doctrine of the foregoing Ages. He cannot expect that we should judg of M. Daille's accusations of these famous Men, unless he had produced the particulars, wherein I presume M. Daille has vindicated himself. But it would be a great wonder to me, if any Man that has read that Learned Word of M. D. should not be convinced, that no such custom, nor any thing like it, was established in the Three first Ages of the Church, which he proves by Arguments insoluble. First from their constant Universal Declaration, that God alone is to be Worshipped and Adored, which he evidences by one instance as remarkable as any the Church affords, the Argument of *Athanasius* against *Arrius*, (in which cause the whole Church was engaged) that Adoration is peculiar to God alone, whereby he proved that Christ is God, because otherwise he could not be Worshipped as he has always been of the Christian World, *Lib. 1. cap. 2.* from a concession as Universal, that no Created Being is to be Worshipped or Adored, particularly evidenced from the remarkable Disputations of *Origen* against *Celsus*, c. 4. from the imputation of *Atheism*, charged on Christians by the Heathen for rejecting their multitude of Deities, which they never vindicated but by this answer, *That they Worshipped the true and only God*, cap. 12. for that the *Jews*, who were most jealous of Images, and the Adoration of any but one God, are never found to have objected against the Christians the Worship of any such, or of any other but one God (the Case of the Trinity excepted,) &c.

But when he tells us, M. Daille does at last grant its being in use in the fourth Age, he should have told us likewise what more is proved in the same place, cap. 17. how its shewn to have found a constant opposition in those beginnings and e're since, ascending from the times of *Luther* up to that Age: sometimes before him by the *Valdenses* in *Bohemia*, in the Year 1512. by the *Taborites* the same sort of People, Anno 1430. by *Wickliffe* and his Followers in *England*, 1372. That Images were opposed by *Leo Isaurus* and several other Emperors, with the consent of all the Eastern Churches, in the eighth Century; and in the sixth by

Severus,

Severus, whose Fact in breaking Images though *Gregory of Rome* did not approve, yet he consented in this, that by all means we were to avoid the Worship of them. That in the beginning of the fifth Age, not only Images were opposed by *Epiphanius*, but the Worship of the Dead by his sharp reproof of the *Collyridians*, Women that offered Cakes to the *Virgin Mary*: That even in *St. Augustin* himself it appears that the Honour then in use, at least by the Churches approbation, was quite different from what is now pretended, who says of the Saints, *Honorandi propter imitationem, non adorandi propter Religionem*. This I have taken liberty to transcribe, that we may know the reason upon which *M. Daille* grants its growing into use in the fourth Age, and challenges it to evidence by this opposition which he shews it to have found in its first beginning and all succeeding times, that it could not be in use in those first Ages which are silent in it, and that it was but then beginning when it met with its first opposition.

“When he presses *M. Daille* with the improbability of his knowing the sentiments of former Ages better than they who immediately succeeded them. As its not allowable that he that has read the many convincing evidences throughout that whole Book on which *M. Daille* grounds himself, should urge against him only a bare improbability of his understanding the sentiments of foregoing Ages, without the least confutation of the things on which he grounds himself: So neither is it directly to the question, for this does not necessarily suppose that *M. Daille* should know the sentiments of foregoing Ages better than they; for they might know their sense well enough, and yet embrace opinions which themselves thought probable, and not presently apprehend wherein they contradicted the sentiments of their Predecessors.

“As for that, *he says*, to make it still less credible, that *M. Daille* “has quoted in his Book several express Texts, by which it’s shewn “that they pretended, in Praying to Saints, to follow the example of their Predecessors. It’s idle either to expect a satisfactory answer to such an uncertain Discourse, or to hope to gain belief, when he has not given us the particulars, by which only it can be judged how far it does conclude.

But now the advantage he takes at present from this consent of this being in use in the fourth Age, is only this, “That he hopes “those of *M. Daille*’s Communion will have more respect to these “Men, than with him in derision to give them the name of Reliquarists, and that as they dare not accuse those of Idolatry by “Praying to Saints, or of destroying that trust which Christians

“ought to put in Jesus Christ, so he hopes henceforwards, that
 “they will not cast the like reproaches on the Church of *Rome*,
 “when they consider they cannot do it without accusing at the
 “same time those excellent Men. This he may promise himself,
 that we shall not shew any thing like derision of those excellent
 Men, nor give them reproachful names: But what he further
 aims at, depends upon the truth of his supposition, that by accu-
 sating the Church of *Rome* as Idolatrous in this respect, we cast the
 same reproach on those famous Men: A thing, that he who knows
 the mighty difference we plead between the practice first grow-
 ing into a custom, and those gross extravagancies to which it is
 since encreased, should not have supposed without shewing the
 practices to be the same. Which how they first began, and by
 what degrees encreased to their present height; as, First, From
 Mens desires to one another to be mindful of them after their de-
 parture; Secondly, From an opinion that some help was commu-
 nicated to the Church from the fellowship between the Militant
 and the Church-Triumphant, grounded upon a supposition, that
 if Souls departed were mindful of any thing, they bore the same
 affection to their Members as when on Earth, and so would inter-
 cede with God for them; which, Thirdly, Begun to be more
 confirmed by some miraculous effects which God was pleased to
 work in places where the memory of the Martyrs was had in
 Reverence: Which, Fourthly, Gave occasion to those Prayers
 which were made upon a faint supposition of their knowing things
 below, which Prayers were rather Wishes than Prayers, as *Cas-
 sander, Utinam Sancti orent*: And so grew by degrees, as Men
 willing to justify themselves in what they had gave entrance to,
 persuaded themselves more of the probability by framing suppo-
 sitions to themselves of God’s wanting not means to make known
 their desires to them; ’till it came at last to be received, that God
 really did make them known by ways best known to himself;
 which is now made matter of Faith, and the practice thus encrea-
 sed absolutely commanded: Those who are willing to see parti-
 cular information, I refer to that excellent Book of Bishop *Usher’s*
 Answer to the Jesuits Challenge; and for the degrees by which
 the publick Forms now in use got possession in the Liturgies to
 Dr. *Chaloner’s* Progress of Heresie.

This Digression in me I hope is pardonable, since M. *Condom*
 himself led me out of the way, with whom I now return to follow
 the design.

S E C T. IV.

Concerning Invocation of Saints.

Here, in the first place, he acknowledges, " That the Church
 " of *Rome* does teach them, that it is profitable to pray
 " to Saints. Now this the Church of *England* declares to be
 unprofitable, and a vain invention not grounded upon any War-
 rant in Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

*39 Articles of
 the Church of
 England, Ar-
 ticle 22.*

But he goes on and says, " The Church of *Rome* teaches them
 " to pray to Saints in the same spirit of charity, and according
 " to the same order of fraternal society, which moves us to de-
 mand assistance from our brethren here on earth; whence
 " their Catechism concludes, that if Christ's mediatorship re-
 ceive no prejudice from the intercession made to the faithful
 " who live with us, neither does it from the intercession made
 " to the Saints. But here we must take leave to observe, that if
 the ground upon which they found this Doctrine be, as he inti-
 mates, that Relation and Fellowship which Saints departed have
 with the Church here, as we the living members have one with
 another; as I confess may be implied in the instances given in
 that Catechism of *Job's* praying for his friends, &c. mention'd,
 before it infers the conclusion here spoken of: yet it cannot be
 said, that this Church teaches men to pray after no other manner
 to the Saints than to their brethren that are living, nor with no
 greater confidence of success: since the Council expressly decrees
 for the *Invocation* of them, and also for *Mental Supplication*: and
M. Condom acknowledges a peculiar acceptableness of these with
 God, upon account of their virtues, p. 9. and their Catechism
 expressly teaches, that God confers many benefits upon us for their
 sake and merit.

*Council. Trid.
 Sess. 25. Dec.
 de Invocation.*

*Cat. Rom. de
 Cultu & Inv.*

" He passes on to shew us, from their Catechism, the difference
 " between their imploring the aid of Saints, and the assistance
 " of God, that they pray to Saints, to undertake their cause
 " with God, but to God to give them the things they ask, and
 " therefore their Forms are different, that where they are not,
 " the intention of the Church reduces them all to this difference.
 Not denying, for the present, but the intention of the Church
 may be to reduce them to this distinction, yet it shall remain ques-
 tionable, whether it may lawfully use such Forms, as, according

to

to their nature, are proper only to God, and by which themselves express desires that ought to be peculiar to him to the Saints with a different intention.

“ For a further confirmation of the sense delivered, he produces the injunction of the Council to the Bishops, what they ought to teach the people concerning Invocation of Saints, “ That the Saints, who reign with Jesus Christ, offer up to God their prayers for men, that it is good and profitable to invoke them after an humble manner, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid and assistance, to obtain of God his benefits, through our Lord Jesus Christ his Son, who is our sole Saviour and Redeemer. After which it condemns those who teach a “ contrary Doctrine. I shall find it necessary for my purpose, to set down the particulars, how it declares it to be impiety, to say that Saints ought not to be invoked, or that they do not pray for us, or that it is folly to pray unto them.

*Sess. 25. Dec.
de Invoc.*

Hence he again concludes, “ That to Invoke the Saints, in the sense of this Council, is to have recourse to their Prayers, for obtaining benefits from God, through Jesus Christ: so that in reality they are obtained no otherwise than by Jesus Christ since through and in his Name. And here *M. Condom*, not taking notice, that aid and protection are mentioned by the Council, as distinct from the Prayers of the Saints, the Advertiser has, *p. 13.* and tells us, “ That it is a kind of aid, succour and protection to recommend the miserable to him, who alone can comfort them. Such protection (he says) we may receive from Saints, but yet he does not say it's the only protection to be received or expected from them: though, for my own part, I am as desirous, that this should be the only sense of their Conceit as themselves pretend to be; so they will grant, for the future what I desire, that those who have or do place any further reliance on them, or seek them for greater purposes, are hereby declared to be condemned as Idolaters; which if they refuse to grant, they argue both to little purpose.

“ From the premises thus laid, he presumes they shall be no more accused of forsaking Jesus Christ, when they beseech his members, who are also ours; his children, who are our brethren, and his Saints, who are our first fruits, to pray with us and for us, to our common Master, in the Name of our common Mediatour. Plausibly, said I, confess, but not so well considered on by one, that should have known, that the hope of our acceptance with God, depends upon his promise; which promise is made to those that ask of God immediately in his Son's Name:

Name : and again, that the honour due to Christ, as our Mediator, is not given him in that acceptable manner, when we pretend to give it him by means of our own chusing, as by those applications, which he has taught us to make unto God, through and in his Name and Merits : upon which ground the Church of England well argues, That we are to make our application to God through Christ alone, for that the promise is made to them that pray in his Name, and the Apostles tell us, that he is our Advocate and only Mediator.

*Homily of
Prayer.*

He further informs us, “ That the Church of *Rome*, when she offers to God the dreadful sacrifice, to honour the memory of his Saints, does not sacrifice to them, but God in memory of them, rendring thanks to him for their victories, and demanding their assistance, to the end those whose memory they celebrate upon earth, would vouchsafe to pray for them in heaven. Suppose it, and yet hereby is confest by their demanding the assistance of these persons, by vertue of this sacrifice, that they do it in expectation of something from their intercession, as well as from Christ’s merits ; which seems to me a gross absurdity, that they say the benefits they seek from the Saints are sought through Christ’s merits ; and yet when they offer the sacrifice of Christ, which pleads all his merits to God, they should not so totally depend on that, but expect another assistance from the Saints.

From the Doctrine thus proposed he infers, “ That they neither rob God of the perfections of his essence, nor attribute to the Creature any of those qualities which are peculiar to him only ; in that they do not, as he says, ascribe immensity, or the knowledge of the secrets of our hearts, to the Saints, as having any such of themselves ; but to say a creature may have some knowledge communicated to it by God, is not to elevate a creature above his condition ; God himself by making known future things to his Prophets, having shewn, that he can, when he pleases, communicate such things unto a creature : whereas none of them hold the Saints to have any such knowledge by their own power. But if this should not be to elevate the creature above the condition it is capable of, if God please to communicate such knowledge to him, yet it is raising him to such a condition, which we are not sure he has : and whereas, he says, they do not hereby rob God of any perfections peculiar to him, because a creature is capable of having such as they give to Saints communicated to it ; it is worth considering, whether to give perfections peculiar to God till he does commu-

communicate them to such as we are not assured he has given them, will not be looked on by God as a Dishonour to him, if he has really not communicated them; for otherwise how can it ever be a Dishonour to him to ascribe the peculiar Properties of his Nature to any other, there being none but he can, when it pleases him, possess with them in great part.

After which, he concludes, " They cannot in respect of this Doctrine be Idolaters; which he endeavors to prove by an Induction of several Arguments, the strength of all which depends on these Suppositions, " That the Saints in Heaven do know our Desires, and have certainly the Knowledge of humane Affairs communicated to them by God; that they do and have a power of assisting us by their Prayers; which Power proceeds from their Acceptableness in God's sight, for their Virtues, which are the gifts of his Grace. But if these Suppositions fail of Truth, as they are altogether without ground, all there said, avails nothing to exempt them from Idolatry.

Whereas he infers at last, " That the exterior Veneration which they give to Saints, ought to be judged of from their interior Sentiments. This is a thing that must be left in Dispute for the Reason given by me, *Sett.* 3.

Now after our View and Remarks upon M. *Condom's* Explication of this Particular, it is fit we should collect the Points in difference; which are these;

First, Whether the Saints have such a certain Knowledge of humane Affairs, as can be sufficient Ground for us to request their Help?

Secondly Whether supposing the Intention of their Prayers to the Saints, be quite different from what they have in those they make to God, this can justify them in the Use of Forms couched in the same Terms?

Thirdly, Whether, as the Church of *Rome* grounds in part these Prayers to Saints upon the Fellowship of Christ's Members one with another, so the Invocation of these which it requires, be nothing but a bare desire of them to pray for us; or be not taught to be an humble supplicatory Desire, and a Religious Worship, as that signifies an Act of Devotion, and piece of Gods Service?

Fourthly, Whether this ought to be made a part of Faith, that the Saints do know our Necessities and Desires, and all men obliged upon this account to invoke them?

Fifthly,

Fifthly, Whether particular Persons that do not alwayes maintain this distinct intention of the Church, are not chargeable even with direct Idolatry?

Sixthly, Whether, if this Distinction has not been alwayes maintained by all Persons, or be difficult to be maintained, the Church, which teaches this from Scripture, does not prejudice the Foundations of Faith?

Now if to the Points thus collected, we subjoyn the Sentiments of the Church of *England*, we shall see what this Exposition will make against us, and what Differences it hath left untouched.

Touching the First then; The Church of *England* declares, Homily of Prayer, Par. 2.
That the Saints have no such Knowledge, as to make them capable of Invocation; that they have no special Knowledge of the Desires or Necessities of particular men; the Scripture saying, *Abraham is ignorant of us*; and that the inward Desires in which Prayer chiefly consists, are only known to God.

As to the Second, She does not say what the Sentiments of the Church of *Rome* are, or that some of them may not direct their Intentions as they pretend; but that others of them have not done it, she argues by their appropriating to particular Saints the Tutelaship of certain Countries, and Defence of distinct Cities; to others the Protection of several Arts and Professions; to others, the Cure of particular Diseases; all which she looks upon as derogating from Gods Providence, and Evidence of peculiar Trust in Saints. But that supposing this Intention of theirs kept entire, their use of external Adoration, and such Forms as are only applicable to God, does make them guilty of Idolatry, it sayes not, only in general, that external Adoration is peculiar to God, and that it should not be given to any thing else, and upon what Ground equivocal Gestures expressive of that Adoration, ought not to be given to any other in Religious Worship, I have shewed, Hom. against peril of Idolatry, part 3.
Scct. 3.

Concerning the Third, Our Church has said, That Invocation (meaning thereby Prayer, as an Act of Devotion) is proper only to God: But in this Point *M. Condom* hath left us without sufficient Explication of the Sense of his Church; he has told us to what end the Council commands us to pray unto them, and that it teaches the profitableness of it, and that it pretends not to exclude Christ, when it teaches us to have this recourse to the Saints; but he has not told us what Degrees or Measures our Desires are confined to. Hom. of Prayer, Part 2.

E

another

another manner of Desire than that used to our Brethren upon Earth, because the Council decrees Invocation, a Word never used to express any Request made to Man; it also requires this to be made after an humble manner, and even with Mental Supplication; but it gives no Bounds to these Desires. And I must and do maintain, that he that prays to Saints (though holding the Supposition that they pray to God for him) yet if he prays with the same Intention of Mind to these, as he does to God, either intending to do that to these, which they do to God for us, or which himself does to God when he prays unto him, comes so near to an Idolater, that no man can possibly distinguish them. But as we cannot judge how far the Intent of a man's Desire goes by any outward Expressions, it is God only that can pass this Censure; however the Church has not sufficiently provided Means to preserve this Distinction in all its Members, in that it has left the Desires of men to go in this Worship of Saints as far as Superstition & a blind zeal can carry them.

As to the Fourth, It denies it to be any part of Faith, that the Saints departed have any certain knowledge of humane Affairs, as I have shewed before; and consequently denies it in the Churches power to make it such, or to oblige any to invoke them upon this account.

Hom. against
Idolatry, pa. 2.

To the Fifth, Such as have not maintained this distinct Intention, but have reposed Trust in the Saints, and relied upon them for Protection, the Church of *England* plainly declares to be Idolaters. And if this distinction of the Intention, be that which makes their Church not to command absolute Idolatry, the thing which *M. Condom* Pleads for, then all those that do not preserve and maintain this distinction, are Idolaters, when they let it go. So that our Church has cast no reproach upon them falsely in all her *Homily against Idolatry*, unless she has falsified Matters of Fact, which we have reason to think she has not, till they disprove them; since she professes to relate them as things done in that time, the knowledge whereof she may be well presumed to have; and since they are also no other, than such as very probably flow from such Principles. And such as these she also declares to destroy apparently Christ's Mediatorship, who approach the Saints out of a particular dependance on their Merits.

Ibid. par. 3.

To the Sixth, The Church of *England* says of Setters up of Images, intending no less I suppose of Promoters of Devotion to Saints, if they are Bishops, or such as have the Care of Souls, it is to shew themselves to have no regard to the Church
of

of Christ, and to account the multitude of Souls redeemed by him, vile, and not worthy their Care. And undoubtedly the Church of *Rome* is so far criminal in this respect, and the Idolatries or other Abuses are particularly chargeable upon her; as, First, She teaches, that for profitable Doctrine, and beneficial to Salvation, which is in all probability the contrary, and which Experience has shewed otherwise. Secondly, As she has not in the judgment of any reasonable man sufficiently secured that all her Members shall preserve that infinite distance between God and his Saints and Angels, of whom they demand the same Effects; which if they do not at all times maintain, they are Idolaters, as the Heathens were: And how can it be presumed that ignorant Christians in the Devotions of their Hearts understand that distance between God and his Creatures, which is not signified in their Words, which their Teachers can hardly find out a Distinction to difference. Thirdly, So far as it has contributed to raise the Reverence of Christian People towards the Saints above the Grounds that our Christianity has revealed; for tho' I should in part allow the Distinction in the *Roman* Catechism, about the Angel's Refusal of the Worship tendered him by St. *John*, that he refused only the Worship due to God alone; yet it is plain in that place, *Rev.* 22. 6, 9. that St. *John* knew the Angel that shewed him the Vision, to be distinct from God, that sent him, which is also clear throughout the whole Vision; and yet he, that had (questionless) a clear apprehension of one God, tendered the Angel such a Worship as he refused to receive; and there can be no Reason to think, but that if the Extasie of a Vision carried this Apostle so much beyond himself, wise, as well as ignorant, through a blind Zeal, acted by a carnal Spirit, may be carried to the like excess in respect of the Saints, or any other Object of Religious Worship.

*Car. Rom. de
Cultu & Inve-
cat.*

Now how far the Church of *Rome* may be vindicated in the first of these Respects, which render her liable to the Idolatries of her Members, must be left to the Judgment of those, who without all prejudice will consider what is said by the *Roman* Church for the profitableness of this Practice to Salvation, from Grounds only proper to Christianity; (Matters of Christian Religion being determinable only from them:) And what is said on the other side, of the unprofitableness and danger of it, and of its inconsistency with Christianity. How far she is excusable in the second, by considering whether the Means, if she has provided any, be sufficient to preserve in all a just and constant apprehension of the infinite distance between God and his

Creatures, whilst they have recourse to those in their Necessities, as well as unto him. In the third, by comparing the Limits, if she has set any to this Worship of Saints, with what has been done on the other side, by Bulls and Indulgences from the Head of the Church, that I may not mention any things of particular persons tending to this purpose, who have published many things of the same Nature with that fullsom Book of *Contemplations on Holy Mary*, lately sent out among us, to raise the Devotions of Christians to so far above all grounds from our common Faith.

My further Business is, only to consider what of these things in difference are taken off either in part or in the whole, by this Explication which M. *Condom* has given us of his Churches Sense in this Point.

Concerning the first of them, he only intimates a possibility of God's giving them such a Knowledge, though he supposes it certain that they have it; yet whilst he tells us the several Methods by which God can make such Desires known to them, but dares not fix upon any by which he does it, it shews they have no Assurance from their Christianity, that God has given them any such Knowledge; nor indeed has M. *Condom* offered any Grounds for it from thence.

To the Second, he says, That we ought to understand them, to reduce all such Forms to the Sense by them declared. But let that go as far as it will to excuse them from Idolatry, it will never justify them in the Use of such Forms to the Scandal of their Christian Brethren, and to the Reproach even of Christianity it self, whilst they give Religious Worship to the Saints as well as God, fly to them in their Necessities with the same Expressions of their Desires as to God himself.

The Third he is altogether silent in; neither telling us what that Invocation is, nor how far the Desires of our Hearts are to be enlarged in those Prayers to them.

As to the Fourth, he has shewed us, that their Church teaches, that the Saints do pray for us, and that we are to invoke them, and to fly to their Prayers, Aid and Protection, and condemns those who teach a contrary Doctrine; but says nothing here to justify it, but something in the End of the next Section: Of which in its Order.

The Fifth he mentions not, neither will any of his Reasons given to free those from Idolatry, who maintain such a distinct Intention as he argues upon, ever justify or clear those who have not always maintained it.

In the sixth he only vindicates his Church in part, in that she has let her people know, by her Catechism, a difference between their prayers to God, and to the Saints : but he does not shew us wherein the Church has declared what manner of desires, which are required to be humble, our prayers to them for these purposes are to be made with, nor any bounds that she has set to them, nor wherefore such methods have been taken by the Head of the Church, as well as particular members, to advance the Reverence of Christians to Saints, above the grounds taught by our Christianity : nor does he shew us the least warrant from Scripture, upon which their Church teaches this, and commands it as a practice beneficial to salvation, which in it self is so dangerous and destructive.

S E C T. V.

Of Images and Reliques.

“ **A**S for Images (he says) the Council of *Trent* forbids the
 “ believing any virtue or divinity in them, and the de-
 “ manding any favour from them, or putting any trust in them,
 “ and ordains the honour given to them to be referred to what
 “ they represent. Yet it commands *an honour to be given to them*, tho’
 with a further reference, and thereby either decrees an honour
 to be given to the Images themselves, if not for their own sakes,
 yet for the sake of them they represent, or at least first to be gi-
 ven to them, though not terminated or stayed there, but directed
 further to what they represent.

“ All these words of the Council are as so many Characters
 “ (he says) to distinguish them from Idolaters, in that they
 “ ascribe no other virtue to their Images, than that of exciting
 “ the remembrance of those they represent. If these are the
 only Characters that distinguish them, we may from themselves
 conclude, that those who give them any other virtue are Idolat-
 ers.

But then, to confirm this, the only ground on which they ho-
 nour Images, he endeavours to shew us by examples. “ First,
 “ he says, the figure of Christ crucified, excites in us a more
 “ lively remembrance of him who died for us, upon which re-
 “ membrance they are moved to testify by some exterior signs,
 “ how far their gratitude bears them, and by humbling them-
 “ selves.

" selves before the Image, they shew their submission to their
 " Saviour: so that, in the Ecclesiastical style, their intention is
 " not so much to honour the Image, as the person whom it re-
 " presents in presence of it: for which he cites the Council of
 " *Trent*, which says the honour we render to Images has such a
 " reference to those they represent, that by the means of those
 " Images which we kiss, and before which we kneel, we adore
 " Jesus Christ, and honour the Saints, whose Types they are.
 But, under favour, if he only humbles himself *before the Image*,
 to shew what respect he has for his Saviour, and does not withal
 give some respect *to the Image it self*, he does not answer the
 Council of *Trent*, which first decrees, that honour be given to
 the Images themselves, and then adds this, which he has cited,
 as the *reason* of that Decree. not as an *explication* of it. And
 thus the Catechism commands the teaching, that it is not only
 lawful to have Images in Churches, but also to give honour and
 worship *to them*, when the honour which is established or given
 to them is referred to what they represent. So that in this
M. Condom seems to use a little extenuation, or at least ambiguity;
 for his instance tells us only, that he humbles himself *before the*
Image, and from thence he pretends to infer a direct conclusion,
 which dares not conclude positively his intention to be only to
 honour the Apostle or Martyr before an Image, but *not so much to*
honour the Image as the Apostle whose it is; and then cites the
Trent Council, as making for both this instance and the conclu-
 sion from it, when he does not positively infer that which his in-
 stance intended to infer, and which the following instances seem
 to infer.

Seff. 25. De-
cret. de Invoc.

Rom. de
Cultu & Invoc.

Pont. de Rege-
rid. Imaginum.

The Pontifical might something favour his purpose, if it did
 not at the same time pray that God would bless and sanctifie that
 Image for the purpose of obtaining the prayers and help of the
 Apostle or Martyr, which implies a supposition, that they shall
 be rather heard for this honour given to their Images.

" But the intention of the Church, when she honours Images,
 " (he says) may be seen by that honour which she renders to the
 " Cross and to the Bible: In the first he appeals to all the
 " world, whether they do not see, that before the Cross she
 " adores him who bore our Iniquities upon the wood. What
 the world sees of their adoring Christ who suffered on the Cross,
 is not material, so long as it sees they give a distinct worship to
 the Cross it self, as well as unto Christ. Witness their *Missa de*
Sancta Cruce, where in the Gradual we read thus, *We adore thee,*
O Christ, for that by thy Cross, thou hast redeemed the world; and
 then,

Missa Rom.
ex dec. Concil.
Trib. Missa de
Sancta Cruce.

then, *We adore thy Cross, O Lord.* So that *M. Condom* has chosen an ill instance to make us believe they give no worship to the Image, but only to those represented by them: nay if they put the same trust and reliance on other Images, as on their honour of the Cross, we may conclude they do not think them so void of virtue as is pretended, for in respect of their honour given to the Cross, they pray thus, " God, who by the blood of thy Son, didst intend to sanctify the sign of the quickning Cross, grant that they who rejoice in honouring the same holy Cross, may ever joy in the protection.

Ibid.

The instance of the Bible is wide from the purpose, for their Church has no where decreed any Religious Worship to be given to that, and though some of them may use it with a foolish or perhaps superstitious respect, does that give excuse to their extravagant use of other things?

But *M. Condom*, presuming upon the strength of what he has said, concludes, " It would be very great injustice, to accuse these practices as idolatrous, there being an excessive difference between such as put their trust in Images, and those who declare they use Images only to excite and raise their memories and minds towards heaven. All which does enable me to conclude, that where this difference is not maintained, this use of Images in Religious Worship shall be absolute Idolatry.

There is another sort of Images not mentioned by *M. Condom*, though I suppose not designedly omitted, because he is treating about Images commanded to be worshipped, which those are not; but I am obliged to take notice of them, because mentioned by the Advertisement, p. 14. and also because the Church of *England* charges the making them as a Crime upon the *Roman* Church: Images of God, made for an Historical use, to express the Histories of the Old Testament in Forms, which God sometimes appeared under to his Prophets; such Images, says the Church of *England*, ought not to be made, because God cannot be represented; and *Moses* forbid the *Jews* to make any Representation of him, because when he gave them the Law, they saw no shape. The Advertiser endeavours to defend the Church of *Rome* by saying, " That it does no more pretend to derogate from God's invisible and spiritual nature, than God himself when he exhibited himself under that form. And possibly it may not pretend to it, but yet it may derogate from the glory of his nature nevertheless. But he tells us, " The Council does not pretend thereby to represent or express the Divinity, or give it any colours. But 'tis not what they pretend to.

*Cat. Rom. de
Cultu & Ve-
nerat.*

to do, but what they do, that can vindicate them in this matter: now their Catechism says, "The Pastor shall teach the people, that certain properties and actions, which are attributed to God, are signified thereby; as for instance, when the antient of days, in *Daniel*, is painted sitting on a Throne, with the Books opened before him, they are to understand, that thereby is signified the eternity and infinite wisdom of God, whereby he sees both the thoughts and actions of men, that he may pass judgment on them. And is not this evidently to do the things they pretend not to do? No Man can say certainly the *Egyptian* Hieroglyphicks, of which kind were the Statues of their Gods, and to which the prohibition of *Moses* may reasonably be thought to relate, were used by them to give a full and perfect expression of the things they designed them to represent, but rather for some seeming Analogy which those Natures had with what they intended.

But to return to the Controversie before us, and to collect the points in difference, that we may see, how much of it *M. Condom's* explication has put an end to.

The First dispute is, Whether Images ought to be set up in Churches, and used in Religious Worship?

The Second, What sort of Image-Worship is commanded by the Church of *Rome*?

The Third, Whether that practised in the *Roman* Church be not Idolatrous, or does not necessarily tend to 'Idolatry'?

The Fourth, Whether the Idolatrous practises of particular Persons, are not in a great measure chargeable justly on the Church itself, whilst it commands the use of Images without warrant from the Word of God?

*Hom. against
Idol. 3d. p.*

Touching the first of these, the Church of *England* declares, that in part she would not stick to grant them that Images may be made, but with this limitation, that it be such as are not used in Religion, such as are not in danger to be Worshipped nor of any Worship'd; but that Images cannot be set up in Temples without danger of Idolatry, arguing, that so the *Jews* understood their Law, which made them so zealously oppose the *Roman* Emperors who endeavoured to introduce Images into their Temple; that the Cherubs over the Altar cannot justify the use of them, for that we must obey God's general Law, and not run to particular dispensations: That such Images as have been so set up, have been and were at that time Worshipped, and that they cannot be set up long without Idolatry, since there can be no sufficient means to prevent it, so long as they are suffered, there being

ing so great a proneness in Man's nature to Idolatry, and so great strength in an Image to draw carnal minds to it.

Concerning the second, it takes notice only of what *Naclantus* has said upon it, whose Doctrine it sticks not to call Idolatry, *That we are not only to Worship before the Image* (as some too cautiously speak) *but to Worship the Image, and that with the same Worship that is to be given to the Prototype.* But what the Church decrees in this point we have seen, that though it be not what *Naclantus* professes, yet it's more than *M. Condom* is willing to confess, and is altogether without any warrant from our Christianity.

As to the third, our Church says not any where that I have observed, that to Worship before an Image is Idolatry, nor does it say that sort which the Council has decreed is Idolatry; but it says in general, that the use of Images in Religious Worship necessarily leads to Idolatry, and let me add, that which the Council decrees does lead somewhat more to it than the other, in that it's more difficult to give a Worship to the Image, and at the same instant direct it to the object it represents; nay, this creates so great a difficulty, that it shall be very hard for a Man to preserve himself from it, in his Devotions to the Saints by their Images; as it's no easie matter for a Man to preserve so many distinct intentions as are necessary to the directing a Reverence to, and yet not fixing it on the Image, but directing it with his Devotions to the object it represents, which must not stay there neither, if that object be any other than God or Christ, so as to fix any trust upon it, but must go further to God, in whom alone their trust is to be reposed. But then as to the practises of particular Persons, she sticks not to call them Idolatrous, and fears not to determine it from what she relates of their Pilgrimages to Images, their repairing to them to be healed of Diseases, their hanging up Crutches before them to shew the vertue they had found by and from them. Wherein, if she relates true matter of Fact, as that we have great reason to believe, we need not fear, that she can be justly taxed by any as fixing Calumnies upon the *Roman Church*, when she speaks of so many Idolatries practised in it.

To the last, our Church has said, that for Bishops, whose is the care of Souls to maintain or set up Images in Churches, is to shew themselves to be careless Pastors, that have no respect to the Souls for which they are to be accountable. And undoubtedly the Idolatries, or other Crimes of particular Persons in this practice, are highly chargeable on the Church of *Rome*; which

F

commands

*Cat. Rom. de
Cultu & Vene-
rat.*

commands that, as a practice beneficial to salvation, and condemns those who reject it, which creates such difficulties in the **Worship** of God as make Idolatry almost unavoidable: especially in the simple sort, for whom, Who will or can undertake that they shall preserve the Devotions of their hearts so entire as they ought for God alone, among such diversity of Objects and Relations? It will be to little purpose to say the Council has taken care to prevent abuses, when it has enjoined a practice so liable to them, unless the necessity of using them were as evident as the danger. Besides those remedies, as they have taken but little effect, so neither are they likely, whilst the Church is so far from seeing or owning any such abuses, that she commands her Pastors to teach the People, not only that it is lawful to have Images in Churches, and to give Honour and Worship to them, when the Honour is referred to the Prototype; *but that it has been done with exceeding good and benefit to the People unto this very day.*

Now what satisfactory defence has *M. Condom* made for his Church in all or in part of these points? when first he presumes it lawful to use Images, and that in Churches and Religious Worship, and acknowledges the Church of *Rome* to command Honour to be given to them for the sake of their Prototypes, (this at least it does command, though he is not willing to own so much) but yet shews us not the least warrant from Holy Scripture upon which this command is founded. When also those very reasons which he has used to vindicate his Church from commanding direct Idolatry, do necessarily involve all those in it who ever have conceived any vertue in Images, or terminated any Worship on them, and likewise shew it extremely difficult to avoid Idolatry, and almost impossible but that the vulgar should be ensnared thereby.

*Concil. Trid.
Sess. 25.*

But *M. Condom* goes on, and says, "That after the same manner we ought to understand that Honour which they pay to Relicks; but this he says without citing the Council, which, had he look'd into it, would have taught him that it ought to be after a quite different manner. Its decree indeed is only general, that they are to be venerated by the faithful, but when it comes to its Anathema, it not only condemns them that say veneration ought not to be given to the Relicks of Saints, or that these and other their Monuments are unprofitably Honoured, but those likewise that shall say, their Memories or Relicks are in vain frequented for imploring of their help. So that if this be allowed to interpret the veneration it enjoins to be given to Relicks, it is far different from the Honour given to Images, not on-
ly

ly in *M. Condom's* sense, but even in the sense of the Council, for it declared no vertue to be in, no trust to be reposed, nothing to be hoped for from Images: But in these it supposes some vertue, something that may contribute help, and encourages Recourse, yea, Pilgrimages to them for that purpose: And this the Catechisms confirms so perfectly, that the only argument it brings upon this Subject, is to confirm the People in a confidence of help by them, for it says, *If the Vestments, Towels, yea, the Shadow of the Saints, when living, did drive away Diseases and restore Health, Who dares deny, that God, by the sacred Ashes, Bones, and other Relicks of his Saints, does miraculously work the same effects?* with more to the same purpose. *Cat. Rom. de Cultu & Venerat.*

And having shewn this, I need not say any thing to what reasons are brought by *M. Condom* to justify that which is not the declared sense of the Council, yet so far as they may seem to relate to it, I shall consider them in short, after a necessary reflection on what is said by the Catechism, to build up the People in a vain and pernicious confidence of help from them.

To this, I say, therefore, it is not for them to ask us, Who can deny but God may do this or that? but to shew us that he does: No Man will pretend to limit, much less deny the effects of God's Omnipotent Power; but every Man ought to look for sufficient evidence that this or that, is the effect of his Power, before he believe it, especially before he ground a dependance upon any thing as endued with a vertue from him to work such effects. And then, to what is said before this in that Catechism, concerning the miraculous effects that God was pleased to work at the Sepulchres of the Saints and Martyrs in the Primitive times of the Church, I answer, That God's doing such things then, is no argument that he does the like now, neither does it give us any more ground to expect the like, than his empowering Men to work Miracles to presume on him for the same power still. Besides we know God was pleased, in condescension to Mens infirmities, to win them over by means that ministered to that love of the present World and the advantages of it, which Christianity being received obliged them to cast off: So that to assure Men, or give them hopes of those things from the Saints, which God assures them not of from their Christianity, is still to maintain in Men those affections to the present World which are inconsistent with their Profession, and the ready way to cause them to set up the Saints in the highest place of their affection, when they are taught to have recourse to these for such things of the present World which God has given them no absolute promise to supply.

And therefore 'tis in vain for M. *Condom* to urge us to consider, *That they Honour them as Victims that have been offered to God*, when the Honour that is paid them is not barely upon this account as he would insinuate, but upon a quite different score, *That of obtaining help from them*, the hope of which from others may easily alienate a Man from God, when he seeks not in all his necessities immediately to him alone.

“Whereas, he invites us further to consider, how a Man's love “to another propagates itself without being divided, to his Children, Friends, and after that, by several degrees to the Representation of him, to any remains of him, and to any thing “that renews it in his remembrance, and that Honour has the “like Progression, and that the Exterior Worship (he might have added also Interior, for such they give to Saints in mental supplication, and seem to do the same when they confide in them, and frequent their Relicks for help) “has its source in God himself, “and returns back to him, so that this Worship which himself “alone animates cannot create his Jealousie. To say that God himself animates a Worship which they presume to frame for him, and foolishly give to others, out of a pretence of Honouring him upon so little grounds from their Christianity, does very ill become a Bishop. But questionless he clean forgot himself, when he would have us gather from the Progress he marks of Love, how pleasing this Honour, that has the like Progression, must be to God; when the Author of the Book of *Wisdom*, cap. 14. vers. 15. has shewn us that foolish affection thus propagating itself to have been one of the chief originals of Idolatry: An instance enough to make all Men afraid, how, through a fond zeal and carnal fancy, they frame the Worship of God according to their own pleasing Notions.

As vain and altogether as unbecoming is his other conceit, “That as God is not jealous of the love of Men when they love “their Neighbour for the love of him, no more can he be thought “to be of his Honour, when out of a respect to him we Honour “those whom he has Honoured: For dares he say, that by the Honour God has given to his Saints, he has made them the objects of our Worship, as he has our Neighbour the object of our Love? Might not the Pharisees, with greater reason and shew of wisdom, have pleaded for their *Corban*, that God being to be Honoured before and above their Parents, what was vowed or designed to his Honour, could not without high offence be given to their Parents, and yet does not our blessed Saviour tell them, that hereby they made void the Commandment of God?

Since

Since M. *Condom* is willing after all to acknowledg "a Power
 " in his Church, to abate of these things according to the Exi-
 " gencies of Times, that her Children might not be slavishly
 " subject to sensible things; as it makes but little for the Cred-
 dit of his Church, which has endeavoured to impose such things
 on those who only desired to be disentangled from them, pro-
 fessing them to be Clogs that kept down their Souls, and de-
 pressed them in their flight to Heaven; and has thereby caused
 so great Division in the Church of Christ; so I hope it gives us
 ground to say it is now high time to abate them to her Chil-
 dren that have so long lain under the Burthen.

But what great part of our Controversies are abated by this
 better understanding he pretends to have given us, I am not able
 to see after so close a Consideration.

Then for the things he concludes with, "That it is great In-
 " justice to accuse their Church of placing all her Piety in these
 " Devotions to Saints: It is a great deal more than ought to be,
 that she places so great a part of it therein; and if any have
 censured her, as placing all, or the chief of it therein, them-
 selves have given too just occasion for this Censure, by their un-
 warrantable Means that are used among them to make men vain-
 ly zealous of these Devotions.

But such a Conclusion as he ends with, I should little have ex-
 pected from a person that has treated hitherto with such seem-
 ing Moderation: To say, their Church was obliged to condemn
 all that reject this Practice, as being obliged not to suffer any
 Practice which is beneficial to Salvation, to be despised; nor a
 Doctrine authorized by Antiquity, to be condemned by Novel-
 lists, is very strange in a man that has not pretended to prove
 this Practice beneficial to Salvation, nor at all shewed it to be
 authorized by Antiquity; and has scarce been able by all that he
 has endeavoured, to vindicate from absolute and direct Idola-
 try, not in the least from leading unavoidably to it.

SECT.

S E C T. VI.

Of Justification.

NOT to dispute as yet whether this Point be the principal, or was proposed by the Reformers as the most essential Cause of their Separation ; if *M. Condom* thought it so, he has taken but little pains to represent the Doctrine of his Church in a Point so material, out of sixteen Chapters of the Council on that Subject to mention but two Passages , neither of which express the Substance of their Doctrine. Whereby he has occasioned me the Trouble of drawing an Abstract of their Sentiments out of the Council, before I can free my self from his confused Expressions, or propose the Doctrine of the Church of *England* upon this Subject, thereby to determine the Matters in Dispute.

The *Council of Trent* then concerning the Justification of a Sinner, Decrees as follows ;

Concil. Trid.
Ses. 6.

“ **T**hat all Men are lapsed with *Adam* (*cap. 1.*) That
 “ hereupon (*cap. 2.*) God sent his Son Christ, whom he
 “ doth propose a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, for
 “ the Sins of the whole World : But though he died for all,
 “ (*c. 3.*) yet those only receive the Benefit, to whom the Mer-
 “ rit of his Passion is communicated. That we are to conceive
 “ of *Justification* (*c. 4.*) as of the Translation of Man from
 “ the State wherein he was born, as a Child of *Adam*, to the
 “ State of Grace and Adoption through Christ, which Change
 “ is not wrought without our being washed in the Laver of Re-
 “ generation, or desire so to be. That the beginning of *Ju-*
 “ *stification* (*c. 5.*) in persons adult, is the preventing Grace
 “ of God, *i. e.* his free Calling, whereby Man consenting, and
 “ co-operating with his exciting and assisting Grace, is dispo-
 “ sed to prepare himself for *Justification*, which he does wil-
 “ lingly, and might refuse. Which Disposition is wrought
 “ after this excitement of Grace (*c. 6.*) by believing willing-
 “ ly the divine Revelations and Promises ; particularly, that
 “ God justifieth the Sinner through *Grace*, and then out of a
 “ Sense of Sin, turning from *God's* Justice, to his Mercy,
 “ hoping

" hoping in him for Pardon, and thereupon beginning to love
 " him, and hate Sin, purposing to be Baptized, and to begin
 " a new Life. That *justification* followeth this Disposition,
 " (c. 7.) which is not only the Remission of Sins, but the Re-
 " novation of the inner Man, and hath five Causes; the Final,
 " the *Glory of God*, and Eternal Life; the Efficient, *God*, who
 " washeth away Sin, and sanctifieth, the Meritorious, *Christ*,
 " who by his Passion hath merited *Justification* for us, and sa-
 " tisfied his Father; the Instrumental, the Sacrament of *Bap-*
 " *tism*; the only Formal Cause, *Justice given by God*, whereby
 " we are renewed in the Spirit of our Minds, and not account-
 " ed only, but made truly just, every man receiving it ac-
 " cording to the good pleasure of the *Holy Ghost*, and accord-
 " ing to his own proper Disposition, receiving together with
 " Remission of Sins, Faith, Hope, and Charity. That when
 " it is said, *We are justified by Faith*, and freely (c. 8.) it ought
 " to be understood, because Faith is the beginning of *Justifica-*
 " *tion*, and the things that precede it, are not meritorious of
 " Grace. That although it be necessary to believe (c. 9.)
 " that Sins are not remitted to us but by the free Mercy of *God*
 " through *Christ*; yet we are not to believe they are remitted
 " to him that vaunteth, and reposeth himself only in the con-
 " fidence and certainty of their Remission; neither ought it
 " to be said, that *Justification* is perfected only by Faith, ex-
 " cluding all doubt. That those who are thus *justified* (c. 10.)
 " by bringing forth good Works, are more *justified*.

By taking the like View of the Doctrine of the Church of
England, in this Point, we shall easily discern the things in
 difference: She then declares,

1. **T**hat we are accounted righteous before God only for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own Works and Deservings; wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome Doctrine, and full of Comfort.

Articles of
 the Church of
England.
 Arti. 11.

2. That by Justification, She means the Forgiveness of our Sins and Trespases. That this being received of God's Mercy and Christ's Merits, embraced by Faith, is taken and allowed of God for our perfect and full Justification. That nothing on the behalf of Man, does contribute to this Justification, but only a true and lively Faith, which Faith is also the gift of God. But this Faith does not shut out Repentance, Hope, Love, Dread, and the Fear of God, from being joyned.

(2.) Hom. of
Justification,
 part 1.

joyned with Faith in every man that is justified, but it shutteth them out from the Office, or justifying; nor does it shut out the Justice of good Works necessarily to be done afterwards of Duty to God, but only excludes them from deserving our Justification, which comes freely from the Mercy and Grace of God, whereby he has provided that Ransom to be paid by Christ, which all the World in any part was not able to pay of themselves.

(3.) *Ibid* p.2.

3. That this Saying, that we are justified by Faith only, is not meant as if justifying Faith were alone in any without Charity, &c. at anytime or season; nor the other, that we are justified freely, so as to imply that we may be idle, or that nothing is required to be done on our parts; neither that other, of our being justified without Works, that we should do nothing at all; but thus, to take away clearly all merit of our Works to deserve Justification at God's hands, and also to express the Weakness of man, and the Goodness of God, the imperfection of our Works, and the most abundant Grace of Christ, and to ascribe the merit and deserving of our Justification to Christ alone. That though we have, and ought to have Faith within us with Hope, Charity, and other Graces, and do never so many good Works thereunto, we must renounce the Merit of all our said Virtues that are or may be in us, as things too weak and insufficient and imperfect to deserve remission of Sins, i. e. our Justification. and must trust only in God's Mercy, and the Sacrifice of Christ for the same.

(4.) *Ibid*, pa.3.

4. That therefore Christ himself is the only meritorious Cause of it. That our own Works do not justify us, to speak properly of Justification, i. e. to say, our Works do not merit or deserve Remission of Sins, but God of his own Mercy gives it us through the Deservings of his Son: Nevertheless, because Faith doth send us to Christ for this Remission, and by it we embrace the Promise of God's Mercy, and of the Remission of our Sins, which thing none other of our works properly do, therefore it is said that Faith without Works doth justify us.

(5.) *Hom.* of Faith, part 1.

5. But this Faith that justifies, is not a dead or carnal, but a living Faith; and this living Faith is a full Trust in God through Christ, which upon the consideration of the greatness of his Mercy, which it apprehends and relies upon, is at the same time moved through the assistance of the Spirit, to serve and please him, out of this pure and only Principle, the Love of God.

Now he that will consider and compare these Doctrines with each other, will find, that they both agree in the lapsed State of Mankind, and the necessity of God's sending his Son, whom he hath set forth to be our Propitiation, and that though he
died

died for all, yet those only are benefited to whom his merit is communicated: but when they come to express the nature of Justification, the Church of *Rome* conceives it to be, not only the Remission of sins, but likewise the Renovation of the Inward man; the Church of *England*, by Justification, means only Forgiveness of sins: which is the main difference that runs through the whole Controversie. For hereupon the Church of *Rome*, pursuing it's own notion, makes the beginning of Justification to be the answer to God's call, and the following his exciting grace to the belief of God's promises, thence hoping in him for pardon, and thereupon beginning to love him, and hate sin, purposing a new life: which disposition is followed with Justification, of which it sets up different causes, particularly making the only formal cause of it, to be Justice or Righteousness given by God, whereby we are renewed in the spirit of our minds, and not accounted only but rendred just, every man receiving it according to his disposition. The Church of *England*, on the other side, holding a quite different sense of Justification, declares Christ the only meritorious cause of it, by what he suffer'd for the expiation of our sins, and Faith, the only means of receiving and applying his merits for this purpose, which Faith it declares to be a full trust in God's mercy, through Christ, for the remission of our sins, (supposing always Repentance as necessary to make this confidence lively and Christian, not carnal and presumptive) excluding nevertheless even Faith it self, as well as all other graces and works, from being any way meritorious of this remission of sins, which is only wrought by Jesus Christ: not that it does in the least deny, that Christ merited grace as well as pardon, or that God by his grace doth infuse into our hearts, Faith, Hope and Charity, and all other graces, whereby the renovation of the inner man is wrought; but supposing always, that this sanctification is wrought by God's spirit in all justified persons, it denies any of these graces, and all inherent righteousness to be deserving of this Remission of sins, which God gives us freely out of meer grace upon the score of Christ's merits.

Now then, upon a view of the whole, we see the ground of the difference lies in the different apprehension of Justification, and herein certainly the Church of *Rome* is mistaken; whilst she confounds Justification with Sanctification, Remission of Sins with the Renovation of our Minds: and taking Justification for what it properly signifies, Remission of Sins, the Council of *Trent* has made that the formal cause of Justification, which has nothing

to do in the Remission of Sins, which are not remitted by being extinguished by contrary dispositions, but by the Merits of Christ purchasing their pardon.

Again, By departing from the Scripture-language, and the true meaning thereof, in making Justification consist in the infusion of Righteousness, which it does not properly signify, there is appearance of reason great enough to cause men, that are jealous of the glory of God's grace and the merits of Christ, to think they claim remission of sins as due to that infused righteousness, by having whereof they say they are righteous before God. But yet inasmuch as it makes Christ to be the meritorious cause of Justification, and says in the place M. Condom quotes, that it is necessary to believe that our sins are not remitted but by the free mercy of God through Christ, I dare not charge it as destroying his Merits by this Doctrine; but wherein I do charge them with this will appear in the next Section.

But however, it has gone beyond its power in making that matter of Faith, which before was only a position of the Schools, and which in it self is not true, especially since it has proceeded further to declare that Doctrine of Justification which it has thus set down to be so necessary to be received, *that without believing it a man cannot be justified*, and has thereupon proceeded to make

(1.) Can. 10. Canons, whereby they condemn him that says, (1.) We are formally justified by the merits of Christ. (2.) That we are justified only by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, or only by remission of sins, without inherent grace and charity. (3.) That justifying Faith is nothing but confidence in the mercy of God, who remitteth sins for Christ. (4.) That Justification is not increased by good works, but that they are fruits only and signs of it. All which Propositions, though condemned by them, are true, taking Justification in its proper notion for the forgiveness of sins; for what is a man justified by but only the justice of Christ, and by remission of sins, if Justification be only the Remission of sins, and that effected only by Christ? and, supposing the same, what are we formally justified by, but his merits? and what is justifying Faith else, supposing the same, but a confidence in the mercy of God, who remitteth sins for Christ's sake? and how is Justification increased by works, if it be the free remission of sins through Christ, without consideration of them?

To come therefore at length to M. Condom, who says, "That, seeing the Scripture explicates Remission of sins, sometimes by God's covering them, sometimes by his blotting them out by his grace, that makes us new creatures, to form a perfect

Idea

Vid. Preface
to the Ca-
nons.

- (1.) Can. 10.
(2.) Can. 11.
(3.) Can. 12.
(4.) Can. 24.

“ *Idea* of Justification, both these are to be joined together. Could he have shewn any one place of Scripture, wherein Remission of sins signifies their being blotted out, by making us new creatures, I might allow his *Idea* reasonable. But the place he cites in the Margin, *Tit. 3. v. 5 6, 7.* is not of that clearness as to make much for him, when the Scriptures every where distinguish the Remission of our sins, from our being turned from them; the pardon of them, from our having sin destroyed within us, and consequently our Justification, from our Sanctification, and though both are wrought by Christ, yet it speaks of them as things distinct, ascribing the benefit of the one, to the sufferings and satisfaction of Christ and God’s mercy; the other to the effect of his grace and holy spirit: The words in that passage of the Epistle to *Titus* are these, *But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his grace we should be made heirs of eternal life.* Now, it’s true, the Apostle here setting forth our salvation, effected through the mercy of God in Christ, for the manner of it, sets down no more than the washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; but though the laver of Regeneration effects both the remission of our sins by the death and merits of Christ, and the renovation of our minds by the Holy Ghost which is shed on us, we are not therefore to think of them, as if both were the same thing, because both are conferred by the same Sacrament, when it’s apparent that they are different mercies, one the effect of Christ’s death and sufferings, the other the effect of the Holy Ghost, which is shed on us: nor is it necessary, that what the Apostle adds of our being justified by his grace should be understood of the grace of the Holy Ghost shed on us for the renewing of our minds, but rather of that kindness and love of our Saviour to save us, and of that mercy according to which he saves us without the works of our own righteousness.

We believe indeed our sins not only to be covered, but also entirely washed away by the blood of Jesus Christ and the grace of Regeneration; but we do not think fit to confound Justification, which signifies the Remission of sins, and Renovation, which destroys sin within us, one with another, nor to think the latter, which is effected but in part in this life, to be meritorious of the former; and should think we did too much lessen the merit of his

blood, if by allowing the effect of it to what it ought to be allowed, the working Sanctification in us ; we should not consider it also to that other effect of wholly meriting for us the pardon of our sins.

Whereas he argues at last, “ That the Righteousness which is “ in us is truly such, and that even before God ; had not I reason to say as before, that their making Justification to consist in the infusion of Righteousness, gave too great appearance for men to think they claimed Remission of sins as due in some measure to their own Righteousness ? when M. *Condom* can thus plead for the truth and reality of it, and for its being a righteousness, and that before God. But to give him an answer, It is not by us denied to be a Righteousness in the sight of God, any further than to this effect, that it is not a righteousness that renders us void of sin, nor that can in the least merit for us the remission of sins, nor that can abide if he should try it with rigour, or be extream to mark what is amiss therein.

When he comes at last to acknowledge it too true, “ That the “ flesh rebels against the spirit, and that in many things we “ offend all ; so that though our Justice be truly such, yet it is “ not perfect Justice, because of the Combate of Concupiscence, “ so that we are obliged to confess with St. *Augustin*, That our “ Justice in this life consists rather in the Remission of sin than in the Perfection of virtues. Though I could wish he had express’d himself in all the words of St. *Augustin* in that place, *That our Righteousness though truly such in the end it aims at and is referred unto, true goodness ; yet is such in this life, that it consists rather in the Remission of sin, than in the Perfection of virtues ;* for hereby every work, though good, as aiming at a good end, is acknowledged imperfect, in that it attains not to it : yet I am glad to find him profess so much of truth, and could wish his Church had made the like declaration, but it seems rather to speak the contrary, when it condemns him that shall say, *the Just sins, though only venially, in every work*, Can. 25. which I see not how it could condemn, if it held our Righteousness not to be Perfect Righteousness by reason of the Combate of Concupiscence : for how can that which is not perfect Righteousness justify its self in respect of God’s Law ? and if not, to say it is a venial offence against it, because not arriving to that absolute perfection required by it, is as little as can be said.

S E C T. VII.

Of the Merit of Good Works.

AS to the Merit of Good Works, it's true, as he says, their Church teaches, " That eternal life ought to be proposed both as a grace, which is mercifully promised through Christ, and as a recompence which is faithfully rendred to our good works and merits in vertue of this promise. But whereas he adds, " That least humane pride should flatter it self in an opinion of presumptuous merit, it also teaches, that all the price and value of a Christians works proceed from sanctifying grace: though it has express'd something of this nature, yet he seeks greatly to impose upon us, when he tells us, it teaches it for the end he speaks of, *the prevention of presumptuous merit*; for the Council really adds this as a *reason, why eternal life ought to be proposed as a recompence of our merits.* Its words are these, *For whereas Christ infuses constantly the power of his grace into the justified, which power does always precede, accompany and follow the works they do, and without which they would upon no account be pleasing to or meritorious with God; we are to believe nothing more wanting to the justified, to the end they may be looked on, as having fully, by their works, (which are wrought in God) satisfied the Divine Law, with respect to the present life, and to have truly merited that eternal life, which they shall receive in it's time, if they depart the present in a state of grace.* It goes on, — *So that hereby neither our own Righteousness is set up as properly our own, nor is the Righteousness of God passed by or rejected, but the same is said to be our Righteousness, because it is in us, and we are justified by it; and the same is also Gods, because infused by him for the merit of Christ.* When therefore the Council proceeds thus to shew wherein the price and value of good works consists, it does it not intending to take men from a confidence in the merit of their works, but with an intent to shew the grounds whereon it supposes this confidence may be built: and what it adds to shew, that they set not up their own righteousness, refusing God's, does clearly evidence, they place our Justification in the Righteousness that is within us, though they acknowledge its infusion to be of God; from whence it follows by a plain connexion, that they profess a *real merit* and *intrinsic value* in a Christian's works, although they confess them

*Concil. Trid.
Sess. 6. cap. 16.*

wrought by grace, & that they are meritorious on that account alone. It's true the Council adds what M. *Condom* after, and desires to be read with care,--“ Although Holy Writ esteems good works so much, that Christ himself promises a glass of cold water shall not lose its reward; yet God forbid a Christian should glory in himself, and not in our Lord, whose bounty is so great to all men, that he will have those gifts which he bestows upon them to be their merits. But still it does not deny them to be *merits*, though it owns them first as the *gifts of God*, nor does it any where resolve us what it means by this forbidding a Christian to *glory in himself*, and not in our Lord: if understood according to the rest, it can only signify, that a Christian should not glory in any thing *as done by his own power*, but should acknowledge it wrought by the help of grace, and if no more than so, he still may glory *in his works*, though not as *wrought by himself*.

What he adds out of another Session will come to be considered in its proper place, but so far as it relates to the point in hand; that they confess man has nothing to glory, nor for which he may confide in himself, is true; but it is upon this ground they confess it, that we can do nothing of our selves, but all through Christ who strengthens us; not upon any supposition, that *what a man has wrought through Christ* that strengthened him, may not be confided in as meritorious upon that score, for though the Council says, we merit and satisfy in Christ, it can mean no more than *through his assistance* that enables us to do such works; for it sticks not to say the *fruits* worthy of Repentance have a virtue in them, though drawn from him, as wrought by his grace. Besides, there is ground enough to conceive, that they make some distinction between the satisfactory works of Penance, which are spoken of in that Session, and those good works which it speaks of here in the business of Justification; so that what is spoken of the merit of them, cannot be drawn into consequence to prove that they understand no greater merit in these, which are works of a different nature, and whose virtue is endeavoured to be set forth to a different purpose, *viz.* of meriting eternal life, whereas the other pretends only to the satisfaction of a debt of temporal punishment.

Now then to subjoin the Doctrine of the Church of England in this point, which teaches, (1.) *That such Works only are good, which are done in obedience to God's Commandments.* (2.) *That no Works done without Faith are pleasing to God, in that the measures of them are not taken from the facts themselves, but from the ends out of which they are done.* (3.) *That though a man do never so*
many

(1.) Hom. of
good Works,
Part 2.

(2.) 15. Par. 1.

(3.) Hom. of
Justific. Par. 2.

many good Works, yet we must renounce the merit of all our virtues and good deeds, which we either have done, shall do or can do, as things far too weak and insufficient to deserve at God's hands, (4.) our imperfection being so great through original sin, that all is imperfect that is within us, and therefore cannot merit. (5.) That albeit good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins and endure the severity of God's Judgment, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God. (6.) That true Faith is always productive of them, and they are inseparable from it.

(4.) 16. Par. 3.

(5.) Art. 12.

By this we may frame the comparison, and find that both agree in this, That good works are necessary to a Christian; that they are pleasing and acceptable to God, being done both in obedience to his will, and out of the power of his grace; that all Christian works proceed from grace; that a man cannot glory in himself on this score, but in Christ the Author and Finisher of them. But then the difference lies, First, in that the Church of England says, our good works, though pleasing to God, cannot bear the Tryal, if examined by the rigour of his Justice: They on the other side, That a Christian, by his works wrought in God, does satisfy the Divine Law with respect to the present state. We again disclaim all assistance in our works, as things insufficient to deserve Remission of sins, or merit for us eternal life: They on the other side profess our works to have that *intrinsic value* in them, upon the account of their being the effects of grace; as that a Christian may be truly said to have merited by them that eternal life which he shall obtain in time if he depart this life in a state of grace.

(6.) Hom. of Faith, Par. 2.

These being the Two Points whereon depends the Dispute, I am not moved by any thing said here by M. Condom, in vindication of his Churches Sentiments, to recede in the least what the Church of England has declared and professed concerning them. For though the Precepts, Exhortations, Promises and Threatnings of the Gospel, shew that we must work out our own Salvation by the grace of God assisting us; yet they shew not that what is done by us does merit our Salvation, or can in justice claim it of God.

Neither is it altogether so just that his Church should use the Word *Merit*, to express the acceptableness of good Works with God, since She limits it to a Sense different from what was anciently understood thereby.

Nor will I fear to maintain, That those who will have the Works of Christians to merit Heaven of their own *intrinsic value*, though supposing that value still arising from its being wrought.

wrought by *Grace*, do hold a Tenet prejudicial to the Faith, whilst they hold not the Grace of God through Christ, *again necessary to accept* of that to such a reward which the *intrinsic worth of it* does not deserve, nor his free Mercy in bestowing Eternal Life according to his promise. For though the first Principle producing such works, the help granted through Christ, be heavenly, yet seeing that *Grace* does not immediately produce the work, but by co-operating with the Soul of man infected with Concupiscence, it cannot be said, either that such works are truly perfect, or that they can demand a reward as if they had been the Effects of *Grace* alone, without the Allay that Concupiscence and humane Weakness gives to abate their value. Nor will I decline to say, that he that shall maintain the Merit of our good works, such as truly merit eternal Life, is thereby injurious to the Merits of Christ; for since the Scripture not only accounts *Grace*, whereby good works are wrought, to be given us of his Merits, but likewise that *Eternal Life* is the Gift of God through Christ: He that shall ascribe his Merits to the first Effect alone, and not acknowledge them to the second, does not make that acknowledgment of the Merits of Christ, which the Scriptures do oblige.

Rom. 6.

These Gentlemen may hence see by this, upon what account we think them injurious to the Merits of Christ and his *Grace*, notwithstanding their Confessions that they are not acceptable to God, but by and in him, because they think themselves acceptable for the value of their works, which they may still say are acceptable in and by him, because Effects of his *Grace*; but we think require a further *Grace* still, the *Mercy of God* through Christ, accepting them to such effect as they are not worthy of.

Neither do the Three Points, which M. *Condom* thinks so decisive as to this Matter, shewn out of the Council, give us any full satisfaction; viz. "That our Sins are pardoned us out of pure Mercy for the sake of Jesus Christ: That we are indebted for that Justice which is in us by the Holy Ghost, to a Liberality bestowed on us *gratis*: That all the good works we do, are but so many gifts of his *Grace*. That the first of these may give some abatement to their Doctrine of *Justification*, so as to make it not absolutely destructive of the Faith, I have already owned; but that it should give the like to their Opinion of the Merit of good Works, there is not the same necessity upon me to acknowledge: And then it is not material to the Point to say, all the good works they do, are but the Gifts of his *Grace*, unless it be added, that they merit through

through Grace withal, i. e. not of the *intrinsic* Grace that wrought them, but of the *free* Grace of God, that accepts them to that reward which they are not deserving of. The Pharisee in the Parable, that trusted in his own Righteousness, did yet acknowledge it *not of his own working alone*; for he thanks God that he was not an *Extortioner*, &c. nor as other Men; and yet he was not justified, because he had not recourse to God's Mercy.

But not to conceal any thing that may encline us to a favourable Construction; I must also take notice, that the Council of Trent at first proposes Eternal Life as a Recompence which is faithfully rendered to the good works and merits of God's Children in virtue of *his Promise*: And had it staid there, I am obliged to confess it had not decreed any thing prejudicial to the Faith; for having respect unto the *Promise*, it does thereby respect the *Grace*, as *promising*, though not as *bestowing* the Gift. But when it comes afterwards to declare an intrinsic value in our works, and that eternal Life is truly merited by them, its Eye is taken wholly off both from the *Promise* and the *Grace*; for if it had intended to have shewn, that they merit by virtue of the *Promise*, it must have acknowledged, that though they had an intrinsic and real worth, yet it was not such as could render them acceptable for so great a reward, *not supposing God's Promise*.

Those therefore who speak of good works as meritorious by virtue of God's Promise only, though they use an unfit Expression, cannot be said to destroy the Grace of God. But which of these two Opinions shall be said to speak the Sense of the Council? Both are indeed allowed; but those who hold the Extream, are the prevailing part, if *Bellarmino* may be believed in relating Matter of Fact, "The Works of just men are meritorious of eternal Life *ex condigno*, this is the common Opinion of Divines, and it is most true.

Bell. de Justif.
lib. 5. cap. 16.

But then will not the Church of Rome have a great advantage of us by this Concession? Perhaps not near so great as they imagine, when it is considered, First, That this Church allows, though not absolutely enjoys a Doctrine to be maintained, that is contrary to the Faith, and injurious to God's Grace, which it cannot justify as a Church. Secondly, That it likewise has given occasion by its own Definitions to this Doctrine, which in words clearly expresses it, which renders it more inexcusable. Lastly, In that it has further taken upon it to decree an *Anathema* against him that shall say, "That the good works of a man justified do not truly merit increase of Grace and

Conc. Trid.
Sess. 6. Can.
32.

H

" eternal

“ eternal Life, as also encrease of Glory. Which no man can avoid acknowledging, that will profess with the Scriptures, that *the gift of God is eternal Life*, and that *he saves us not by the works of Righteousness which we have done, but of his own Mercy*.

What M. Condom inserts by the way, “ That our Hope and “ Confidence in Christ, does not wholly extinguish Fear on account of our selves, I am not obliged to gainsay, that I know of, by any Doctrine of the Church of *England*; provided I disallow that which is decreed, *Can. 16.* “ If any say or believe “ that he shall certainly have by certainty of infallible Faith, “ the gift of Perseverance to the end, unless he know and have “ learned it by special Revelation, let him be *Anathema*. For though a careful and awful Fear does intermix with a Christians Confidence, yet it may be such as may exclude all doubt without Revelation, having no other foundation than that upon which St. Paul declares, That *nothing shall be able to separate Christians from the Love of God, neither Tribulation, nor Persecution, &c.* because out of a certain knowledge of the sincerity of their own hearts, and the certainty of God’s never-failing Promise, that he will *never forsake* those who *forsake not* him; they may be certain that nothing shall be able to separate them from their Duty.

“ As to that great Advantage therefore which he may be “ thought to have gotten of us, in that the real Difference between us in these two Points, of *Justification* and the *Merit of Works*, , may not appear so great as it was thought and “ pleaded by the first Reformers, who declared it one of the “ principal causes of their Separation; I answer, That I have evidenced a Doctrine generally held in the Church of *Rome*, and express in the Words of the Council in the Point of *Merit of good Works*, whilst they are taught to be deserving of eternal Life of their own intrinick worth, to be destructive of the Faith, and injurious to the Grace of God; however in that the Council in one place does mention God’s Promise to accept of them, I am unwilling to charge it expressly on the Council, though it seems afterwards to leave the Promise, and plead a real worth in our works, which are wrought by Grace; however those who say they merit *ex condigno*, do certainly destroy the Faith, which are the greater number of their Divines: So in the Point of *Justification*, I have shewn too great appearance, that their Doctrine taken in the most favourable Sense, does prejudice the Faith. Again, having produced the Doctrine of the Church of *England* on both Points, she holds no other than she always did,

did, and still maintains the same; neither does it that I know of, cast any greater reproach on the *Roman Church* on this account, than what the very Doctrine of the Council will maintain it in, and therefore I see no reason to be ashamed of our Doctrine, or think the worse of our Reformation, for this being a part of it. Again, there's none in the least versed in the *History of the Reformation*, abroad, but knows it to have been occasioned by *Luther's* writing against *Indulgences*, which brought in the Disputes of *Merits* and *Justification*, *Purgatory*, *Penance*, the *Authority of the Pope and General Councils*, with many others; and although *Luther* published his Opinions in these points, yet did he not separate from the Church immediately, but desired a *Reformation*; instead of which Pope *Leo* excommunicates him, and condemns 42 Articles extracted out of his Books on these and other points; so that whoever may have pleaded this as the principal, could never conceive it the only Point that gave a ground to the Separation. Besides, even in this point he that shall consider, that the Doctrine of Merit *ex condigno*, was received as the common Doctrine of the Schools, and was maintained by *Eckius*, in his Disputes against *Luther*, and that *Luther* himself did not disown, but that good works were acceptable to God, though not meritorious, nor such as could justify a man before him; and also that they were necessary, and truly righteous too in some respect (as appears by his Book *De triplici Justitia*) and disputed chiefly against that Position of the Schools, which was generally maintained; and shall further consider, that the Council, which, when it came to determine these points, should have examined the affinity that each side had with the Truth, instead of so doing, sets up a Doctrine in point of *Justification*, in the School-terms, to the prejudice of the Expressions of Scripture Language; and in the point of *Merit*, that which sufficiently countenanced the most extravagant Tenets concerning it: and on the other side, with one consent condemned all they could draw out of the *Lutheran* Doctrines upon those Subjects, which seemed any way different from it, without considering in what Sense their Words might be true, nor how far they might agree with Truth; and that immediately after the old Doctrine of the Schools was maintained as the Sense of the Council: whose considers this, will see sufficient grounds to think the Reformers did not charge their Doctrine with any greater Impiety than what they had just cause to conceive therein. And if we, partly through Tract of Time, lessening and abating that heat, which in Disputes causes

Bull. Leon. 10.
An. 1520.

men to oversee the favourable construction that may be put upon Matters, whilst they set themselves to oppose the opposite Extream they see maintained against them ; and partly through their abating those Expressions which they have discerned injurious to God's Grace, and expressing themselves now more reservedly ; may now perceive that something of the Doctrine defined by the Council, is not so destructive of the Faith, if taken with a candid interpretation, as it was at first supposed ; yet this must not oblige us to consent , where such Construction will not reconcile it to Truth, nor to submit to what is dangerous and by experience prejudicial to the Faith, for this reason, that it does not absolutely destroy it. Nor if the Differences in this point appear not so material as they have been thought , is there any reason to presume so much in other Points, before they are as seriously considered. We must and ought to overcome our prejudices, but withall must use our Judgments in discerning whether Prejudice or Truth possess us ; nor must we hold the Spirit of Contention, but yet may hold our Reason, and consult with the Spirit of Truth and Wisdom.

S E C T. V III.

Of Satisfactions, Purgatory, Indulgences.

IN Treating of these, M. *Condom* explicates to us the Ground upon which their Doctrines in these points are founded, to be this ; “ That Christ having made full *Satisfaction* for our sins, “ may apply this *Satisfaction* to us so fully as by an entire submission to free us from all punishment, or so as to remit only eternal punishment, leaving us subject to a temporal : That after the “ first manner he applies it to us in Baptism ; but in the second “ to those who fall into Sin afterwards : That hereupon, the “ Church taking Cognizance of the Offences of its Members, “ when she remits the guilt, imposes nevertheless upon Sinners certain painful and laborious works, as punishments necessary to be undergone in *Satisfaction* to the Divine Justice ; “ which they therefore call *Satisfaction*s. That nevertheless “ out of regard to the favour of the Penitents, or some other “ good works prescribed them, she many times remits part of “ those pains, and this Remission is called *Indulgence*. That, “ God

" God having reserved this Debt of temporal punishment, those who die indebted to the Divine Justice, some pains which it reserved, are to suffer them in the other Life ; for whose relief the Church does further think fit to tender God such Services in their behalf, as being acceptable to him, may mitigate his wrath towards them.

Now as to this, though it be indeed true, that God might, if he had seen fit, have reserved a debt of temporal punishment, after his remission of the eternal, yet that he has so, is a presumption that has no warrant from Scripture. For though God may inflict what punishment he thinks fit on Sinners in this Life, as eternal in that to come; yet we are assured that the Afflictions of his Children that are restored to a state of God's *Grace*, are the Chastisements of his Love, and not the Inflictions of Wrath or Justice: So that to hold it for a necessary Truth, that God does not so remit the Sins of such as fall after Baptism, but that he leaves them to suffer a temporal punishment from his Justice, and that such as have not satisfied it here, are liable to those Sufferings after Death, in a state they must pass before they arrive to Heaven, is a vain and groundless Presumption.

It avails nothing to say, that our Sins after Baptism are the effects of great Ingratitude to God: This might indeed make the *Glory of God* appear, had he declared, *that he would deal with Us after this manner*: but it can never shew us that *he does*, when himself offers us a free Remission, 1 John 1. 9, 10. Our Ingratitude indeed does make our Repentance a Work of greater difficulty, necessarily causeth greater Humiliation in the Soul that is sensible of its abuse of so great a goodness, and greater Mortification to change its self from Sin to God ; but that a true Repentance shall not obtain a total Remission of these as well as other sins, we are no where discouraged to hope.

To say it is *just* that God might have reserved a temporal punishment to be endured by us, may be tolerable ; but to say, it is *beneficial to our Salvation*, that he should have done so, that we may not abuse the facility of a Pardon, is to prescribe God Methods, as beneficial, which it does not appear that he has used for that end. St. Paul shunned not upon the prospect of such abuse, to declare the *free Grace* of Christ abundant to the pardon of many Transgressions ; and thinks he had done as much as need be to prevent the abuse, when he replies, *What shall we say then, shall we continue in Sin, that Grace may abound ? God forbid*, Rom. 6.

Their

Their Tenets then in these points being grounded on a false foundation, the Penances imposed by the Church in the first Ages of Christianity, and the relaxations of the same, can be no way pleaded by them who have assigned them to purposes quite different from the ends they are established to serve by our common Christianity: For it's beyond dispute, with all that know any thing of the exercises of the Churches Power in binding and loosing mens sins in the first Ages of it, that Penances had no other ground in Christian Discipline than as means for the cure of sin; which the Church, being obliged to see to the performance of that Christianity men profess, with good authority obliged those to undergo who had visibly fallen from that profession; not as *Punishments* satisfactory to Gods Justice, but as *Medicines* to work their cure, and to recover them to the state of Grace and God's Favour, which the Communion of the Church ought to suppose them in. And therefore, as they were debarred of that Communion, when they were fallen from Grace, the Church would not readmit them to it, till by submitting to such works of Humiliation as were likely to produce Repentance, they had given reasonable Evidence to her of their having recovered the state of Grace, and thereby a right to her Communion. Now those Penitents indeed, who shewed some extraordinary zeal and fervour in these works of Humiliation, or by some other eminent acts of Piety, shewed themselves to have truly repented, and that the love of God had taken place in their hearts, were many times admitted to the Communion before their performance of all those acts that had been enjoyned them, and loosed from the further severities of that Discipline, that cure of sin appearing to be wrought in them which the Discipline intended. But for Penances imposed to make satisfaction to the Divine Justice, and relaxations from them by the application of a stock of Merits in the Church, there is not the least appearance.

After this laying open the foundation, we must likewise examine the building, and enquire what their Doctrine is in these points.

In that of satisfaction, it's evident they hold those Penitential Works to be *satisfactory*, and that to *God's Justice*, inasmuch as they design them for payments of a Debt of Temporal Punishment; but then after what nature they satisfy, is not so fully exprest. The Council of *Trent* uses the words cited by M. *Condom* in the former Section, which I have shewn not clear, for they say, "These Works of Penance have a vertue though drawn from
"Jesus Christ, and we are still in doubt whether they count them
satisfactions

satisfactions upon account of their *intrinsic value*, being performed by the help of Grace; if so, they give them a worth which they ought not. Their Catechism seems to confirm this sense, saying, "That from Christ, through our good actions, we obtain two great benefits, one, that we merit the rewards of everlasting glory, the other, that we can satisfy for our sins. And this it says illustrates the satisfaction of Christ, whose Grace is herein more abundant, that not only those things are communicated to us which himself alone, but those also which as head over his Members he hath merited and pay'd for his Saints; upon which account, it's evident that the good actions of the Pious are of great weight and dignity. And this also their very accounting them *satisfactions* to the *Divine Justice* requiring this Temporal Punishment does most strongly imply. And if so, then all M. *Condom's* Maxims will not clear them from depending on these works for that which is not in them: But if we must take his word, that after all, what they call satisfaction is only the application of the infinite satisfaction of Christ, we hope to find nothing inconsistent with it.

But here we meet with another Doctrine, that one man may satisfy for another; thus their Catechism tells us, "That those who are endued with Divine Grace may in another's stead pay that which is owing to God, so that after a fort we bear one anothers burthens. And these works, by which men satisfy for others, are commonly called *works of Supererogation*, which the Church of *England* declares, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety, inasmuch as by them men declare, that they not only render to God as much as they are bound, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ saith plainly, *When ye have done all that ye can, say that you are unprofitable servants*. She likewise deplores that gross Superstition that had crept into the World, by which men were lead to place righteousness in Vows, Meats, Drinks, &c. out of which the People were told of a stock of merits in the Church of which others made their Markets. And herein I shall not fear to maintain what is said by her, upon the reasons given, and more, namely, that this conceit of one man's satisfying for another, and that thereby there is a stock of merits, which the Church, by Indulgences, may allow to the account of those to whom it grants them, is not only without warrant from Scripture, or the practice of the Primitive Church, but is also prejudicial to the faith, and injurious to the merits of Christ; whose merits are the only consideration of all Pardon and Mercy. Nor will it

avail

*Cat. Trid. sub
Titulo Que ad
verum satisfi-*

Art 14. of the
the Church of
England.

Hom. of good
Works. Part.
3.

avail to say the merits of the Saints are not such but through him, for then it would be enough to apply his only to that effect ; but whilst his are infinite, those who shall pretend to joyn others with them, when God has only proposed his both as the consideration of his giving mercy and the foundation of our hope, do plainly derogate from Christ and delude the People, who hearing of other merits than those of Christ, vainly purchase them as a new means to place themselves in God's favour.

But M. *Condom* speaks here very sparingly of Indulgences, telling us, " The Council of *Trent* proposes nothing else to be believed concerning them, but that there is a power in the Church from Jesus Christ to grant them, and that the use of them is beneficial to salvation, and does withall intimate, that these principally regard Discipline, which it seeks to prevent from being reassumed by an over-great facility in granting them. But still it teaches all this without warrant ; no power of Indulgences to such purposes as they pretend to grant them, being ever given to the Church by Jesus Christ, nor any such beneficial use of them to be learnt from him upon this score. Nor is it material to observe, that the Council intimates them to regard Discipline, unless we knew how far their Ecclesiastical Discipline does extend : If it reach to the imposing Punishments for the satisfaction of Gods Justice for the debt of Temporal Punishment, which is mentioned as the ground of their exacting these satisfactions, and which the Priest is to have regard to and to enjoyn them, *ad vindictam & castigationem*, it's a Discipline the Church never had. All the World knows, that *Luther* in the first breach about Indulgences did not deny them as to the relaxing of Canonical Penances, but inveighed against the pretences of those that advanced them to a further purpose, and that one of his greatest objections against them was, *That the Pope could Pardon no Punishments but what himself in the Church imposed*, and pleads against his Adversary, that he designed to Pardon no other : So that had the Pope then declared their grant to no further purpose, we might have had some reason to have credited M. *Condom's* exposition. But when the Council coming to the decision of this, which, being the first occasion of the breach, ought, if any thing, to have been particularly discussed, has only declared, " That there is a Power of granting them in the Church, and commended their use, but not determined to what effect, whether to that which *Luther* owned, or that which his Adversaries pretended, what can we conclude less than that it allows them to the effects pretended by those Agents that dispersed them. Wherein *Bellarmin.* fully confirm

Concil. Trid.
Sess. 14. c. 8.

95. *Theses Lut.*
Anno 1517.

confirms us, saying, *Those Catholicks are not in the right, who think Indulgences to be no other than Remissions of Ecclesiastical Discipline:* *Beitar. Lib. de Indulg. c. 7.*

Whose Authority I use not here only as great upon the reasons he gives for his Opinion; as, First, *That if they were to no other effect than this, there would be no need of a stock of merits.* Secondly, *That the Church would herein greatly deceive her Children, whilst freeing them from pains in this life, it sends them to those of Purgatory.* That, Thirdly, *They could not be granted for the dead, that are not under nor in need of the Churches Discipline:* But chiefly upon the matter of fact that he relates, "How many when they receive Indulgences confess and perform their satisfactions, that sometimes the Popes in their Briefs of Indulgence require the Priests to impose Penitential satisfactions, that therefore, in the Judgment both of the Popes and People, they are principally and chiefly beneficial to remit the pains of Purgatory."

But possibly they may tell us, however this Council did something considerable in abolishing those unlawful gains that were made by the markets of them. This indeed might have been something, had they designed it to abolish the Penitential Tax issued out of the Apostolick Chamber sometime before, which rates sins at certain sums; or had it taken effect to that end, but instead thereof we know those faculties to have been since renewed and still confirmed.

Concerning Purgatory, the pretended foundation of it is this, "That those who depart this life indebted to the Divine Justice, some pains which it reserved, are to suffer them in another life, that hereupon they offer Prayers for such, by these kind of satisfactions to win God to be more mild to them in those Chastisements. In opposition to this, our Church has delivered herself thus, *That the Scripture doth acknowledge but two places after this life, the one proper to the Elect and Bless'd of God, the other proper to the Damned Souls:* That (a) therefore the Romish Doctrine concerning Purgatory and Pardons relating to it, is a fond thing, vainly invented, without warrant from Holy Scripture, and rather repugnant to it. It's vain in that it wants a warrant from Scripture, and is likewise very repugnant to it, in that we are encouraged in our Christian course by the Scripture from the shortness of our afflictions, to all which an end is put by death, after which, all that die in the Lord are blest in this that they rest from their labours. I must therefore deny this to be the ground of those Prayers which were made for the dead in the Primitive Church, and am by this alone sufficiently warranted to deny it; that those Prayers were made for the Patriarchs and Pro-

Acts 3. 19.

phets, the Apostles and Martyrs, as well as for all others that departed in the Communion of the Church, and therefore could not relate to any intent of easing them from any pains they were believed to suffer; but rather to the Resurrection, that *time of refreshment* that shall come from the presence of the Lord.

Whereas M. *Condom* pretends to argue from that which is done by God's Servants, (many of whom afflict themselves for the sins of all the People, as well as for their own, out of a zeal to God and charity to their Brethren, affections that all ought to express) "That God out of a delight to gratify these his friends, "accepts of their Mortifications in abatement of the Punishments "he has prepared for others: I cannot but admire to see a Man write so much without Book, as to infer from hence a power in the Church to apply these services to particular Persons in Indulgences, and that these shall be available to ease men of those Punishments they suffer for their sins after death; for to these ends he must say this or else he says nothing, for it's nothing to his purpose, what respect God may have to the Prayers, Fasting and Humiliations of the faithful, to withhold his Judgments from a sinful Nation: And if said upon those other accounts, it's altogether without warrant from his Christianity.

We see then apparently the differences that are unresolved by any thing said in this explication of M. *Condom*, viz.

1. That the Church of *Rome* has advanced a new Article of Faith, upon which it grounds these Doctrines and Practices.

2. That it abuses the Penances used in the Church to ends not warranted from Christianity, neglecting that upon which they take place in it.

3. That in pretending to do things in satisfaction to the Divine Justice, they have not cleared themselves from the scandal given to their Christian Brethren by such a bold pretence.

4. That by setting up a stock of merits out of the supererogatory works of others, they are manifestly injurious to Christ, whose merits are proposed by God for our only trust; they even void, in my judgment, the terms of the Covenant of Grace, which requires, That every man prove his own work, in that as to God every man shall bear his own burthen.

Gal. 5. v. 6.

5. That it pretends to grant Indulgences, to purposes which they never served in the Christian Church of the first Ages, and to an effect even beyond the present life.

6. That it teaches an unknown state after the present life, wherein we are to lie under the severity of God's Wrath for an uncertain time; to the manifest discouragement of us in our Christian

Christian course, notwithstanding their pretence to the contrary, to the destruction of our confidence in God's mercy and our Saviours merits, and to the apparent prejudice of that Christianity they pretend to advance, of which hereafter.

7. And lastly, That as if these things were not enough, they have decreed *Anathemas* (1.) Against him that shall say, "When God remits the sin, he always remits the punishment, (2.) Or, that we do not satisfy for our sins in abatement of the Temporal punishment by works voluntarily undertaken, or enjoined for that end, but the best Penance is a new life; (3.) Or, that these satisfactory works are not the Worship of God, but men's Traditions; (4.) Or, that the Keys of the Church were not given to bind to this effect, and therefore that the Priests who enjoin these punishments use not the Keys to a right end, and according to Christs institution, or that it is a fiction, that after the Remission of the Eternal punishment there most commonly does remain a Temporal, the payment of which the Church in its exercise of the Keys ought to see to; (5.) Or, that every fault and punishment is so wholly remitted to every Justified and Penitent man, at the time of death, that there remains no pain to be endured in Purgatory, before an entrance is opened to him into Heaven. All which *Anathemas*'s are denounced without the least warrant of Scripture, rather in opposition to it.

Concil. Tril.

Sess. 14. § 1

(1) *Can. 12,*

(2) *Can. 13,*

(3) *Can. 14,*

(4) *Can. 15.*

(5) *Sess. 6.*

Can. 30.

And now, in all this, you see I have waved the charge of those abuses which are too apparent in each of these practices.

S E C T. IX.

Of the Sacraments.

Concerning Sacraments in general, the Church of England holds, That they are more than badges of our Profession, or than representative signs of Grace, being sure witnesses and effectual signs of it, by which God does invisibly work in us, and seems to allow them Instruments of the Holy Ghost, for it says of Baptism, that thereby as by an Instrument we are grafted into the Church of Christ. Only as to that which renders them effectual to us, we differ in two things, for they seem to leave out that which we make absolutely necessary, and on the other side make something of absolute necessity which we deny to be such.

Art. 25.

Art. 27.

The Church of *England* necessarily requires Faith in the receivers, and the rest of those preparations which the Scriptures require in those that come unto them. The *Roman* Church teaches, that they confer Grace by vertue of the words which are pronounced, and the exterior action which is performed, upon condition that we put not any impediment by not being rightly disposed. But in that many of that Church have since explained themselves, that, when they say, the Sacraments do confer Grace, *ex opere operato*, they do not mean to exclude the necessity of repentance, faith, and all other necessary qualifications in the receiver, but only that the Sacraments have a virtue in them from Christ's institution, which virtue is not barely the effect of faith in him that receives, but also of the promise of Christ annex to that work: this Controversie seems to be chiefly about words, and their ill and offensive manner of expressing themselves: for we, as we require faith and other qualifications in the receiver, do also in owning these Sacraments to be Christ's Institution, acknowledge their virtue from that Institution, though those qualifications are requisite in us to partake of their efficacy, according to the Divine Promise.

What they on the other side require as absolutely necessary, is the intention of the Priest to do what the Church intends, without which the Sacrament is not effectual. This is by us rejected, in that since no man has assurance of securing the Priest's intention, if this were absolutely necessary to produce the effect there could be no assurance of its ever coming to effect upon us. We therefore say, that the Sacraments, being of Christ's Institution and taking effect by his promise, all that preparedly come to wait on him, in the Ordinances of his Church, have warrant of their effect from that promise, be the Minister's intention what it will.

As to the necessity of these Sacraments, we that allow their virtue and efficacy from Christ's promise to work in us the graces of the Holy Ghost, and communicate the benefits of our blessed Saviour's death, cannot be thought to think them necessary, or that the neglect of them in any, is not the neglect of their salvation.

But then as to the number of them we find another difference, The Church of *Rome* counts seven, Baptism, Eucharist, Penance, Confirmation, Orders, Matrimony and Extream Unction. The Church of *England* acknowledges but two, Baptism and the Eucharist, *i. e.* as ordained of Christ in the Gospel, and as generally necessary to salvation: the other five she counts not Sacraments

ments of the Gospel, " being such as have grown partly from the
 " corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life al-
 " lowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature with
 " the other two, for that they have not any visible sign ordained
 " by God.

There might indeed have been an easie end put to this dispute, if both sides had but considered one anothers meaning, and the Church of *Rome* had not put so great a bar to this consideration, by denouncing *Anathema* against all that should say the Sacraments are more or less than Seven, without sufficiently explaining the difference that is really between them. For the word Sacrament in the general, may (says our Homily) be attributed to any thing whereby an holy thing is signified; but in a strict acceptation, or according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, it means a visible sign exprelly commanded in the New Testament, whereto is annext the promise of free forgiveness of sins, and of our union with Christ: and in this sense our Church acknowledges but two, and there acquaints us with the reasons why she does not receive the other Sacraments necessary to salvation, and in what manner she does receive them. Absolution she owns to have the promise of forgiveness of sins, yet since this promise is not by any express words in the New Testament annext to the visible sign Imposition of hands used with it, she counts it not a Sacrament as the other. That though there be a grace by promise annext to the exercise of it, yet there is no particular visible sign of necessity to be used in it, to which that promise is confined as to Water in Baptism. That though Order has both a visible sign, and a promise of grace, yet it has not the promise of forgiveness of sins, i.e. it has a promise of grace only to a particular effect, not to the general effect of the Gospel. That Confirmation, used in examining persons in the Christian faith, and joyning thereto the Prayers of the Church for them, also Matrimony, Visitation of the Sick, are still retained by the Order of the Church, and ought to be, though not as properly Sacraments, yet either as states of life worthy to be set forth by publick action, and by the Ministry, or as such Ordinances as make for the instruction, comfort and edification of Christ's Church. Supposing hereby undoubtedly, that they want not grace to their proper effects, in what the general promise of God to hear the Prayers of his Church may give them leave to hope from those Prayers that are used with them. And it is not without reason that our Church maintains this distinction, there being so vast a difference between those Sacraments, which

Hom. of Com-
 mon Prayer
 and Sacra-
 ments.

which by virtue of our blessed Saviour's peculiar Institution are Seals exhibitiv of all the promises of the Gospel, and which take effect to this purpose from that Institution; and others that are only means of particular graces to this or that particular effect, some of which also can be hoped to take effect only in consideration of the Prayers of the Church, and have no other virtue than what these Prayers can be hoped to produce.

Baptism.

About Baptism in particular, I know but one material difference, for the Church of *England* sufficiently presses its efficacy and necessity, and has provided what she can, that none may want it: only she dares not determine it of that absolute necessity, as to deny salvation to those Infants that dye without it: The *Romanists* themselves allow the desire of it to supply the want of it to Justification in the adult; and when St. *Peter* tells us, that it is not the washing away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God that saves us in Baptism, why therefore they should not think the design of Christian Parents, dedicating them to God's service, and the profession of Christianity, should not as well supply the want of it in case of necessity, as it does render the washing effectual in the use of it, I cannot apprehend.

Confirmation.

Confirmation is not in the least rejected by us, but used with solemnity becoming such an Exercise and intended to the utmost effect, that the Bishops Prayer, and the Suffrages of the whole Congregation joyned with it, can be hoped to procure of that grace, which may enable all that come thereto both to will and to do, what, before their coming to that action, they are taught they must then resolve upon, *viz.* the profession of Christianity in their own names, undertaking to abide by it with their lives.

Penance.

Touching Penance we believe, that Christ (having committed to his Church the power of binding and loosing mens sins for edification, and likewise committed to her the dispensation of the Myteries of the Gospel Baptism and the Eucharist) has given her

her authority as of admitting to so of casting out of the Church: so that when it shall appear, that any have visibly transgress'd that profession upon which they were admitted members of the Christian Church by Baptism, she has full authority to call such to an account, and to exclude them in part, or altogether, from her communion, till they shall have submitted to and performed such acts of humiliation as may both warrant her to admit them to her communion again by some assurance of their true repentance and recovery of the state of grace, which alone entitles to it; and likewise satisfy the Church for the scandal given by their Apostasie.

Likewise we believe, that all, who being baptized, have made profession of Christianity, are by that profession obliged to submit themselves to this discipline, which the Church exercises for the cure of sin. Further, we prove, that when the Church proceeds aright in the exercise of this authority, excluding those from her communion, who are visibly fallen from the state of grace, and admitting them again into it, after it has wrought the cure of sin, by enjoying such acts of humiliation as have wrought a true repentance, she acts according to Christs commission, and what she does is valid and ratified by him to so great effect, that what she binds on earth is bound in heaven, and what she looses on earth is loosed in heaven.

We further say, That God, having provided this means for the procuring and assuring the pardon of sin by his Church, does both teach private Christians, what course they ought to take for the working in themselves a true repentance by acts of mortification and self-denial; and invite them to bring their secret sins unto the Church, so far as they shall be convinced within themselves, that the Ministry of the Church may be beneficial to them by her Prayers or Discipline to work this effect.

But we declare on the other side, That though we believe the Church has full authority thus to *act* in the cure of sin, yet it has no authority to pardon sin, till after it has wrought the cure: so that if it shall absolve any from their sins, in whom it has not first wrought a true repentance, that *act* is null: for the Church, which is only ministerial to procure, can have no authority to abate that condition, which the Gospel requires to the remission of sins, true Repentance.

And therefore, 2^{ly}. we further declare, That though the Churches Discipline be of great efficacy to procure this condition necessary to the remission of sins, yet inasmuch as it is possible for men to work it in themselves without it by their earnest

nest Prayers, Humiliation and other Endeavours, assisted by God's grace, that the sins of such are pardoned by God without this discipline of the Church.

And therefore, 3/y. we also declare, That whatever benefit may be in mens laying open their secret sins to the Church in obtaining the pardon of their sins: yet there is no absolute necessity on them so to do, for that their sins shall assuredly be forgiven without it, so they be truly penitent.

Also out of a due apprehension of the exceeding usefulness of this Discipline, i.e. Publick Penance in the Church of Christ, and the great decay of Christian Piety, sensibly felt through the want of it, our Church laments its loss, and the abominable abuses that crept into it; of which the iniquity of the age took so great advantage as has for the present rendred it almost impracticable, but to the utmost effect she can, she does exercise it, and to the best for the edification of her children. But whilst we thus lament, that this Discipline, left by our blessed Saviour in his Church, is in so great a measure lost and become impracticable: yet there will not be so much reason to repent of our Reformation upon this account. It was not the Reformation that cast off this necessary and saving Discipline; but the corruptions of former ages, that had brought in abuses to that excess, that rendred it not possible for the Reformation at the removal of them, to maintain it in the authority it ought to have had.

To what degree those abuses were arrived, we shall be able to guess, when we have considered those that are still maintained in the Church of *Rome*; which teaches thus, (1.) "That those who fall from grace, after Baptism, have need of another Sacrament to restore them, and therefore our Saviour instituted this of Penance. (2.) That the Form of this Sacrament consists in the words, *I absolve thee*; the matter of it is Contrition, Confession, Satisfaction, condemning those who say Penance is no other than a Conscience terrified for its sins, and faith to lay hold on Christ for forgiveness. (3.) That Contrition is a grief of mind, joyned with the hatred of sin, and a purpose of sinning no more, which although sometimes it may reconcile to God, yet that effect is not to be ascribed to it alone, without a desire of the other parts of this Sacrament. That *Attrition* nevertheless, or sorrow arising from the fear of punishment and filthiness of sin, which is not perfect Contrition, so it exclude an intention of sinning again, with hope of pardon, is the gift of God, and though with-
" out

Concil. Trid.
Sess. 14.

(1.) Cap. 1.

(2.) Cap. 3. &
Can. 4.

(3.) Cap. 4.

“ out the Sacrament of itself it cannot justify us, yet *in the Sacrament* it disposes a man for receiving the grace of God.
 “ (4.) That, by the Institution of this Sacrament, an entire (4.) Cap. 5.
 “ confession of sins is, *by Divine Law, necessary* to all that fall
 “ after Baptism, God having made his Ministers Judges, to whom
 “ all mortal sins are to be laid open, that they may pronounce
 “ the sentence of their Remission or Non-remission. (5.) That (5.) Cap. 6.
 “ although their Absolution be but the Dispensation of another’s gift, yet they are not barely Ministers to pronounce or
 “ declare to the Church forgiveness of sins, but their sentence
 “ is a Judicial act, and to be look’d upon ratified as the sentence of a Judge, and being of this nature is not to be esteem’d
 “ valid, unless the Priest has a serious intention of pronouncing the sentence of Absolution. (6.) That when God remits (6.) Cap. 8.
 “ the sin, he does not always remit the punishment altogether, that so the order of his Justice requires him to proceed, that
 “ therefore there is a necessity of those satisfactory Punishments or Penances which are imposed after Absolution, to appease the
 “ Divine Justice.

Now by this view of their Doctrine, we may discern how far the practice of Penance in this Church differs from the use it ought to have in the Church of Christ. The satisfactions or penitential works which by the Church should be *first imposed* and enjoined the sinner to work in him a true humiliation, that, thereby being satisfied of his true repentance, it may with authority pronounce him absolved from those sins whereof the cure is presumed; are in this Church imposed *after it has warranted the Absolution* to an unheard of end, the *satisfaction of Divine Justice*. Then again, it exceeds its authority in warranting Absolution, before it has procured the only condition, to which the Gospel renders it, Repentance.

The Church of *Rome* does indeed acknowledge Contrition, or the sorrow that worketh true Repentance, to be a part of this Sacrament, but yet she does not make it *absolutely necessary*, but allows it to be supplied by something that is not *perfect* Contrition: even the Council you see declares *Attrition* to be not only the *gift of God*, but that which does *dispose* a man for *God’s pardon* in this Sacrament, which is in effect to say, that what is wanting to *true Repentance* is supplied by submitting our sins to the Church in Confession, and the sentence or acquittal of the Priest thereupon. That this is indeed their meaning, is more plain from their *Catechism*, which first, its true, sets forth the great benefit and advantage of *Contrition*, yet afterwards,

*Cat. Trid. de
Confess. Sac.
Pœnit.*

as if that were not the only condition of pardon tendred in the Gospel, it requires that the people be further taught, *That although it must be confess'd, that our sins are blotted out by Contrition, yet inasmuch as few arrive to so great a degree of sorrow for them as that requires, they are therefore but very few that can place their hope of pardon in that way : wherefore it was necessary that our most merciful Lord should provide for the common salvation of mankind by an easier way, which out of his wise counsel he did when he delivered the Keys of his heavenly Kingdom to his Church. For, according to the Doctrin of the Catholick Faith, it must be believed and constantly affirmed by all, that if a man be but so affected in his mind, as to be sorry for the sins he has committed, intending withal not to sin for the time to come, although he have not that sorrow which is sufficient to obtain forgiveness, yet when he shall have duly confess'd his sins unto the Priest, all his sins shall be remitted and forgiven to him by the power of the Keys: so that it was deservedly said by our forefathers, that by the Keys of the Church an entrance is opened into the Kingdom of Heaven, of which it is not lawful for anyman to doubt, since it is decreed by the Council of Florence, That the effect of the Sacrament of Penance is Absolution from our sins.*

Joyn then but this to their Doctrin of Satisfactions, Indulgences, and Purgatory, and we shall see how full of Poysons all this Composition of their Discipline is: while the people are first taught and perswaded, that their sins are cured by the sentence of Absolution once pronounced, that this supplies the defects of their Repentance, and opens them an entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven; that the Penances after imposed are not enjoyned as though their sins were not wholly pardoned, but to extinguish a debt of temporal punishment; that there is a stock of satisfactions remaining in the Church performed by others, which they may procure by Indulgences to be applied to themselves: that having this Absolution at their death, they are *not to doubt but that their sins are absolved*, and so there is no more to be feared than some pains in Purgatory, and those to be ransomed too, if any friends after their death will but purchase certain Services to give them ease, or if themselves leave but enough to purchase these endeavours for their acquittal. Who sees not that this destroys our common Christianity? of which I suppose M. *Condom* so sensible, that he durst not propose any thing of his Churches Doctrin in this point, knowing that all his extenuations could not secure it from being prejudicial to the truth.

Extream

Extream Unction.

Extream Unction being pretended to derive its Institution from *St. James*, if we consider his words, we shall better apprehend, whether the Church of *England* be in the right in excluding it from the Sacraments, *Cap. 5. v. 14. Is any sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, and anoint him with oyl, in the Name of the Lord, and the Prayer of Faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.* Here the Apostle directs the sick to call for the Elders of the Church, whom we allow to be the Ministers; and this questionless for their assistance to those effects which the Apostle orders them to assist them in. The means to which he directs are two, *to pray over them, and anoint them with oyl in the Name of the Lord*; and this in order to two ends, *the recovery of the sick, and the remission of sins.* Now to both these effects I suppose the Church of *England* does allow the help of the Elders of the Church useful to the sick, and therefore has provided that none lack this assistance: but inasmuch as the Promises relating to these effects are different, the Promise to one effect being *perpetual* and *common* to the Church in *all ages*, to the other *temporary*, whilst God empowered it to work such effects; the Church, which thinks she can only ground her Faith upon God's promises, does still retain and declare her power in the cure of sin, having a continued promise of God's grace to go along with its Ministry in effecting of it; but not being assured, nor having any promise to assure it, that its Ministry shall be effectual to the recovery of *bodily* health, it dares not warrant it to her children, and therefore does not think fit to use the Ceremony of *anointing the sick with oyl*, which was then used as a sign effective of their recovery. Not that she is not ready to pray for this on their behalf, grounding herself upon the *general promise* God has made to hear the Prayers of his Church: but not having any *sure word* of promise to ground a firm Faith upon, as to the *absolute* recovery of the sick, and it being *the Prayer of Faith*, to which the Apostle here attributes this recovery; (as *Faith* indeed, and that *special* and *extraordinary*, was always necessary to all miraculous effects:) she therefore thinks she cannot use that sign which was then applied to the sick, to assure him of his recovery by that power which God was then pleased to give for the working such cures.

Car. Trid. sub
Titulo Extrem.
unct. qua prap.

That this Reason is not inconsiderable, the Church of *Rome* herself is forced to allow, and thereupon is greatly perplexed to find out a Reason, why the first of these effects the *Forgiveness of Sins*, being provided for by the Sacrament of *Penance*; there should be another Sacrament provided for this purpose: To solve which she has invented a Distinction (not to be found in the Apostles words I am sure) that the *Grace* of this Sacrament is to extinguish our *Venial Sins*, the other being chiefly provided for the forgiveness of *Deadly Sins*. No less is she perplexed as to the other; for seeing *de facto* that the Ministry of the Church does not take effect to the bodily recovery, and withal, knowing it necessary that all who come to a Sacrament, ought to come with a Faith that they shall receive the Benefit tendred by it, she orders that the Priest shall labour to perswade the Sick to offer himself to this *Unction* with no less a Faith than those tendred themselves, who were miraculously cured by the Apostles. “ That if the Sick reap not so much Benefit “ by it at this time, as of old, this must not be ascribed to any “ defect in the Sacrament, but we are to believe it so happens “ for this cause rather, that Faith is *weaker* in the greatest part “ of those that are anointed with this sacred Oyl, or in those “ that administer it, the Gospel telling us that our Lord *did not* “ *many mighty works in his own Country because of their Un-* “ *belief.* And yet for all this, at last she is forced to confess the true Reason; “ That Miracles do not seem so necessary now “ since Christianity has taken so wide and deep a root, as they “ were in the beginning of the Church. Which Reason, as it shews that we ought not to expect the like effects now as then, does likewise fully justify the practice of the Church of *England*, in not using *Unction*, to warrant the recovery of the Sick, tho’ she be ready to assist them with her *Prayers*, which may be hoped effectual in an ordinary way to all that is consistent with the Divine Will.

Ibid.

Ibid.

Marriage.

Whereas our Blessed Saviour was pleased to reduce this State of *Marriage* to its first Institution, and to make the Bond of it insoluble, we do believe it the Concern, yea, the Duty of the Church to see, that its Members joyned together in this holy State, do preserve this Bond inviolable. And the preserving it thus, requiring, as all other Christian Duties, the assistance of *God's Grace*, our Church thinks herself obliged, as to see to the

Marriages.

Marriages that shall be contracted between its Members, so to implore a Blessing on them at their entrance into that State, begging the Assistance of the *Divine Grace* to enable them to live as Christians ought in the State of Wedlock.

And whereas the Apostle has thought fit to represent to us the near Conjunction and inseparable Union of Christ with his Church, by that near and inseparable Union which this State supposes; we forget not the Thanks we owe our blessed Lord, who is thus pleased to unite himself to his Church, nor the Concern that lies on us the Members of it, to preserve an *Union* with him *inviolable*: But we cannot think that because the State of Matrimony is a Sign of that Mystical Union between Christ and his Church, having some analogy with it; that therefore the entrance into this State, has the promise of any *Grace* to joyn or preserve us in that Union with Christ and his Church; and for that reason we exclude it from the Sacraments of Christ's Church, as these are Signs effective of *Grace*.

Order.

We allow the Necessity of ordaining Ministers for the Service of Christ's Church, and acknowledge not only the Ceremony of Imposition of hands in that Action to be of Apostolical Institution, but also that there is a Promise of *Grace* annex'd, to enable persons so ordain'd, to act according to their several Functions, and that with effect to those Ends which their Ministries serve in the Church of Christ.

But we admit it not properly a Sacrament, as I said before, because the *Grace* promised does peculiarly relate to their *Office*, and the Benefit of the Church, not particularly to the Salvation of him that receives it. Neither do we allow the *Grace* here promised, to belong to any but those Orders, that we find from the Beginning in the Church of Christ, *viz.* Bishops, Priests and Deacons.

SECT.

S E C T. X.

Of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

NOW we are come to the great Points that are in dispute about the *Eucharist*, wherein M. *Condom* has greatly enlarged himself, as confident of the Victory.

Here in the first place, he tells us, "The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Saviour is established by the Words of the Institution; which they understand literally, and therefore are not to give Reasons for so doing, but expect Reasons why they should not. We should take this Gentleman off a great Advantage which he presumes himself to have; if we should deny theirs to be the Literal Sense, and plead ours to be it, and oblige them to give Reasons for their imposing a new construction upon them. However, leaving that in question for a time, I must at present examine the Reasons he gives to introduce the Sense he intends.

The ground he proceeds on, I confess is such as must not be rejected as vain in this Dispute; neither must it, on the other side, be allowed to conclude necessarily; for though the correspondence between the Old and New Testament, ought to be greatly regarded, yet of itself it is not sufficient ground to build matter of Faith upon: Again, in whatever it be allowed to conclude, it must be according to the difference between the Old and New Testament, which must still be maintained, and which is undeniably this, That as *Israel* under the Old Testament, were the *Israel according to the Flesh*, and those under the New, are the *Israel according to the Spirit*; so the correspondence between the Law and Gospel, may conclude from things that were carnally under the Law, that the same are spiritually fulfilled under the Gospel; but never that they are now to be fulfilled carnally, because they were then. For instance, when the Apostle argues from *Abraham's* leaving his own Country to go into a strange Land, that thereby also he sought an heavenly Country; it may with the like force be argued, that we who travel after God's Promises, shall certainly arrive to the possession of that heavenly Country, but not that we shall as certainly possess an earthly *Canaan* by the way: So, when he argues from *Adam's* being made a living Soul, that the second *Adam* is a quickning Spirit, we can-

no

not certainly think him to be a *quickning Spirit* in that sense that the first *Adam* was a *living Soul*; but in a much more *spiritual* manner. This being premised, I shall consider his Arguments,

First then, he says, " That as the *Jews* did not in Spirit only partake of the Victim that was sacrificed for them, but did in reality eat of the sacrificed Flesh, which was to them a Mark of their partaking of that Oblation; so Christ becoming our Victim, would have us really eat his Flesh, to assure us in particular, that it was for us he gave it. Thus much I allow the correspondence between the Old and New Testament may prove, that whereas Christ has given us Bread as a representation of his sacrificed Body to partake of, that he thereby intended to make us partakers of his Flesh, to assure us that for us it was sacrificed, but not that it shall hence follow, that because the *Jews* eat *carnally* of the Flesh of their Sacrifices, we must also eat of his after the like manner. Who sees not upon the difference between the Law and the Gospel premised, that the contrary does necessarily follow, that they being the *Israel* after the Flesh did necessarily partake of the Flesh of their Sacrifices after a *carnal manner*, those therefore that are the *Israel* after the Spirit, must partake of their Sacrifices not as the others, but *spiritually*.

" Let then God's prohibiting the *Jews* to eat of the Sin-Offering, because of their Sins not being expiated by those Sacrifices, conclude that now (our blessed Saviour having made himself an Offering for Sin) we ought to partake of this Sacrifice to assure us that the Remission of sins is accomplished for us: yet this shall not conclude against our partaking of this Victim after a *spiritual manner*.

As for God's prohibiting the Children of *Israel* to eat Blood, because it was given for the expiation of Souls, it being a prohibition of eating Blood in *general*, as well as the *particular blood* of their Sacrifices, if it conclude any thing, it is chiefly for the eating Blood in *general*, the reason of its being forbidden being ceased; but yet neither for this doth it conclude necessarily; for then the Apostles could not by their Decree have required the *Gentiles* to abstain from Blood. But suppose it to conclude for our drinking the Blood of our Sacrifice, yet it does not in the least prove that we are to drink it in a *carnal*, and not in a *spiritual* manner; but it will prove if it be allowed conclusive, what will not at all please the Church of *Rome*, that she cannot now withhold the *Sacramental Blood* from us, since our Sins

Sins are fully expiated by the Blood of Christ, for a reason *contrary* to that upon which it was prohibited the *Jews*, because this Blood being shed, has wrought a full Remission of Sins.

Therefore upon so little that has been yet said to the purpose, I admire the Gentleman should tell us, " That our Saviour, to free us from the horror of eating humane Flesh, and drinking Blood in their proper species, thought fit to cloath them under another species, but that the consideration that obliged him to this, did not oblige him in the least to deprive us of the reality of his Substance. For by what Authority does he presume to tell us what considerations moved our Saviour, or how far this or that consideration shall oblige him? Or how has he proved that it was ever the intent of our blessed Saviour to give us the *Real*, as that signifies the *fleshy* Substance of his Body to be by us *carnally* received?

To accomplish then the ancient Figures, we confess our blessed Saviour does give us his Body and Blood to possess us of the Sacrifice offered for our Sins; but to maintain the difference between the Law and the Gospel, our eating must be *spiritual*, not *carnal*. It matters not whether it be the plainness of our Saviour's Words alone, or as joyned with other things that are said concerning it in Scripture, that forceth us to confess and acknowledge what we do; we need no forcing, for we most readily acknowledge all we conceive the Scripture does oblige us to in it; and the Question is, whether any thing said therein will oblige us to take their Sense, or does not oblige to the contrary.

I shall not enter into Dispute of what the power of Christ can do, or whether his Dominion over universal Nature, can make his Body present in several places at once, and under several Extents, and not destroy the properties of a Body in it; his Omnipotence having nothing to do herein any further than it appears his intent to bring something to pass by it. We may therefore without questioning what can be wrought by his omnipotent power, expect an Evidence that what they pretend him to bring to pass thereby, was *by him intended* to be brought to pass before we are obliged to believe it.

Whether therefore these Words, *This is my Body*, will conclude it to be our Saviours intent to make that *Bread* to be *no longer Bread*, but to become the *very Substance of his Body*, is the thing in question; which cannot be presumed before we have considered the whole Discourse of our Saviour, and also what other things

things are said of it by his Apostles, *Matth. 26. 26.* we find it set down thus ; *Whilst they were eating, Jesus took Bread, and having blessed, broke and gave it to his Disciples, and said, Take, Eat, this is my Body ; and taking the Cup, and blessing, gave to them, saying, Drink all of this, for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of Sins: But I say unto you, that I drink not henceforth of the Fruit of the Vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in the Kingdom of my Father.* When *St. Matthew* here tells us, that our Lord took *Bread*, and having blessed, brake, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, *This is my Body* ; and having took the *Cup*, and blessed likewise, gave it to them, saying, *This is my Blood* : Is it not manifest that he says, this *Bread* is my *Body* ? Can this demonstrate any thing, but what he gave to them, broke, blest, and took in order to it, when there is no mark given to know that he intended to speak of somewhat else ? Nor will it avail to say *This* does not demonstrate that he took, at first, because he blessed after he had taken it, before he said, *This is my Body* ; for at least it must be that which he broke after he had given Thanks, and that of necessity is the same *Bread* that he took. Again, his words, *This is my Body*, will never bear such a forced Construction, as *This Bread* is now abolished to make room for my *Body* ; for his Affirmative *Is*, does not in the least alter it, but requires and supposes the thing true at the time he speaks it ; *This* must be *This*, i. e. *Bread* and *Wine*, which God's Word demonstrateth at the time that it is his *Body* and *Blood*. But whatever *This* may demonstrate, it will be impossible to prove the Disciples understood it to demonstrate any thing which the Scriptures express not. Now when *St. Matthew* brings in our Lord speaking after the delivery of the *Cup*, that he would not drink any more of the *Vine*, does he not apparently suppose it to be *Wine* after his delivery of it to his Disciples, or at least when he delivered it ? Nor will it at all advantage them to say, that *St. Luke* makes him speak it before the Consecration or Blessing of the Elements ; for whether he spoke it before or after, or both, it is certain that if *St. Matthew* had understood the *Wine* to be no more *Wine*, he could not have placed these words of our Lord after the delivery of the *Cup*. So when *St. Paul* says, *1 Cor. 10. 16.* *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ ? the Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ ?* Does not he say that it is *Bread* still, though it be the Communion of the *Body of Christ* ? Nor shall any thing hinder but that the substance of *Bread* remaining, we

L,

may

may spiritually communicate of his Body ? If our Communion were carnal, possibly it might be difficult to understand ; but that being not proved, nor to be proved, for the Reasons given from the difference between the New and Old Testament, no man can find any difficulty in apprehending it ?

So then M. *Condom's* great Bluster about our " Saviour's explication usually to his Disciples what he taught in Parables " and Figures, which is not done here ; and his Omnipotence to work whatever he said, falls to nothing. For our Lord's Discourse being easily intelligible according to our Sense of his presenting his Body and Blood under these Elements, to be spiritually received ; but not to be understood so easily in theirs, they have the most need to seek for an explication that shall determine them to their Sense ; especially since it is thus evident that the Apostles understood it to be Bread and Wine, as we do, so that 'tis they have made the forced Construction by denying it. Nor can our Lord's Omnipotence take place here: till it be proved what he intended to bring to pass thereby.

Whereas he says, " The Laws of Discourse that teach us a " Sign receives often the Name of the thing represented, yet " will not allow it in a Sign that has no relation to the thing, as in this instance of a morsel of Bread to signify the Body of man : what if we should say, the less relation it has to the thing, the further it is from being it ; and the more probable to be only a Sign, how would he disprove us by the Laws of Discourse ? which being used only to express our Conceptions, can receive no more bounds than they. Yet had he considered but the purpose for which our blessed Saviour gives us his Body, to be the *Nourishment* of our Souls, he would not have determined so positively, that Bread, which is the *Food* of our Bodies, has no analogy with that which is to *feed* our Souls. He might have found Examples even in holy Writ, where Christ calls himself a *Door*, the *Way*, and a *Vine* ; which things have yet not the least analogy with the *Body* of a man, but yet sufficiently represent the purposes for which he calls himself so, and are easily understood without conceiving him to be changed into a *Door*, &c. or any of these to be changed into him.

S E C T. XI.

Of the Words, Do this in remembrance of Me.

NOT having at all insisted on these Words, *Do this in remembrance of me*; I am not at all concerned to answer what he says to prove, That a Remembrance may be consistent with a real partaking of a thing remembred; being sure, that let him make the best of it, it can never make any thing against me, or conclude that we must partake of Christ in any other manner than what I have set forth.

But whereas he pretends to take an advantage from an Answer generally used by us, That this Remembrance does not exclude all kind of Presence but that which strikes the Senses; so as to make this his own, for that they, though they affirm *Jesus Christ* to be present, yet acknowledg at the same time that he is not present after a *sensible manner*. He must give me leave to say, that, not determining as yet any thing concerning our Doctrine till after it be explained and considered, his Answer is perfectly an *Illusion*, in that though they pretend him not present in a *sensible manner*, i. e. *visibly* appearing to their Senses, yet they own him present in a *bodily* and *carnal manner*, and to be eaten *carnally*; as if a man should swallow a Pill in a Conserve, the Pill is not taken in a *sensible manner*, but yet the very *substance* of it is taken into the Stomach.

I shall not therefore demand by that *Query* which he is pleased to call Equivocal, why they think it not enough to say, *The Son of God is present to us by Faith*; but by that he confesses to be without equivocation, how they come to know by Faith that he is present after a *bodily or carnal manner*? And whether his *Real Presence*, though *spiritual*, known by Faith, is not sufficient to work all the necessary Effects in the *just man who lives by Faith*?

S E C T. XII.

Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England concerning the Real Presence.

WHereas M. *Condom* thinks himself to have gotten great advantages by his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Calvinists in this point, I thought my self unconcerned with his Objections, the Church of England not having tyed her Faith to Calvin or any other, but grounded it on the Scriptures: Only that no man may suspect them to be of any force against the Doctrine held by the Church of England, I saw it necessary to set down and explain her Doctrine, and see whether any thing here urged can conclude it to be in the least absurd or inconsistent with the Holy Scriptures or with itself.

- The Church of England then teaches, (1.) *That the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Prayer.* (2.) *That we therein spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood, we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we are one with Christ and he with us.* (3.) *The Bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ,* (4.) *That we must be sure to hold, that there is no vain Ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent: But as the Scripture saith, the table of the Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of his death, yea, the Communion of the body and blood of the Lord in a marvellous Incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ) is through Faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they trust also to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality. Therefore* (5.) *She prays that in partaking of these his Creatures of bread and wine we may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.* (6.) *That the benefits that we receive by thus partaking of the body and blood of Christ, are the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by these, as our bodies are by the bread and wine.* (7.) *That thus much the faithful see, hear, and know herein, the favourable mercies of God sealed, the satisfaction of Christ confirmed, and the remission of sins established.* (8.) *That nevertheless there is no Transubstantiation or Change of the substance of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper.* (9.) *Wherefore we are not to regard specially the earthly Creatures which*
- (1.) Catech.
 - (2.) Exhortation at the Communion.
 - (3.) Art. 28.
 - (4.) Homily of the Sacrament.
 - (5.) Prayer of Consecration.
 - (6.) Catech.
 - (7.) Homily of the Sacrament. *Ibid.*
 - (8.) Art. 28.
 - (9.) Hom. 1b.

which remain, but always to hold fast and cleave by Faith to Christ the Rock. (10.) *Whose body is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper only* (10.) Art. 28. after an heavenly and spiritual manner. (11.) *Wherefore it is well* (11.) Hom. 16. known the meat we seek is spiritual, heavenly and not earthly, invisible and not bodily, a ghostly substance and not carnal. (12.) *The means* (12.) Art. 16. therefore whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith, (13.) *So that to think that without Faith we may enjoy* (13.) Hom. 16. the eating his body or drinking his blood, is but to dream, a gross and carnal feeding basely binding our selves to the Elements and Creatures.

As for those then that hold it no more than a bare sign, and the Celebration and Communion thereof, barely the renewing our Profession, or a remembrance only of Christ Crucified whom it representeth, they are wide from the Church of England on the one side as the Church of Rome on the other. Nor do those who only hold it a sign effective to apply the benefits of the death of Christ, not supposing it to tender Christ as present to us, and to be received by us before we partake in the benefits of his death, express exactly, in my judgment, the sense of our Church: Although there is so near a conjunction of Christ with his benefits that one cannot well be apprehended without the other.

I conceive therefore, that in the sense of our Church, not only the benefits of Christ, but *Christ himself* is tendered to us in this Holy Sacrament, and is to be eaten by us before we partake of his benefits, not that we are *bodily* to partake of him for this end, but in that it seems to be the intention of our blessed Saviour, under these Elements, to give us himself and to put us in the actual possession of himself; so that in the use of this ordinance as verily as a man does bodily receive the earthly Creatures, so verily does he *spiritually* receive the body and blood of Christ.

For our better apprehension of which Mystery, it will be necessary more particularly to consider, what it is which we do hereby receive, and in what manner we are made partakers of it.

Concerning the first, the truth which we hold you see is this, that we do not here receive *only* the benefits that flow from Christ, but the *very body and blood of Christ*, i. e. Christ himself Crucified; for as the bread and wine avails not to our bodily sustenance, unless the substance of those Creatures be first received, so neither do we partake of the benefits of Christ to our spiritual relief, except we have first a Communion with *Christ himself*. This the words of our blessed Saviour. Job 6. 57, Encline me to believe, where he says, that he that *eateth him* shall live by him, intimating that we must be *partakers of him* before we can have life from him.

him: So the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 10. 16, *The bread which we break, Is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* evidently imply that we are therein to partake of Christ himself. This I take to be that great mystery of our union with Christ, whereby we are made members of *his body, of his flesh, and of his bones:* And this I look upon to be that *eating the flesh and drinking the blood* of the Son of God in the 6th of St. John.

But now if it be demanded how we can eat the flesh of Christ, and partake of his body and blood; to conceive this eating in a carnal sense, is as gross an imagination as that of those, *Joh. 6.* who asked within themselves, *How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* we must not think then, that we cannot truly feed on Christ unless we receive his substance into our bellies, but must consider that the *eating and drinking* our Saviour speaks of must be *spiritual*, according to the nature of his Gospel, and therefore we must enquire therein what it is to eat and drink spiritually. Now then, if we consider what appetites are in our souls, and what those appetites crave, or ought at least to long after, we shall easily discern what it is to eat and drink spiritually. Now we know, that in the 5th of St. Matthew, our Saviour intimates to us, that we ought to have a spiritual hunger and thirst after righteousness; which appetites being necessarily required in us, no man can hence have so gross an imagination, as to conceive that we must take in the righteousness thus hungred and thirsted after at our mouths, as we do our bodily food. Consider then withal the words of our Lord, *Joh. 6. 35, 36, I am the bread of life, he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst: But I said unto you, You have also seen me and believed not:* And compare it with *Vers. 63, 64, It is the spirit that quickneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life. But there are some of you that believe not.* And judg from hence, Whether our Lord does not propose himself as that food which can give satisfaction to the spiritual hunger and thirst of our souls; and if so, whether it can be thought that he is to be received any otherwise than *spiritually* for the satisfaction of those appetites that are *spiritual*: And then withal consider, *Vers. 27, Labour not for the meat that perisheth, but that which shall endure to eternal life;* and, *Vers. 28, What shall we do to work the works of God:* And, 29, *This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.* And, I suppose, it will perfectly appear that our Saviour speaks not here of any eating but what is spiritual, and that, inasmuch as when the People questioned him, *What they should do to work the works of God,* upon his exhorting them

them to labour after the meat that endureth to life eternal; he answers them, that to do his works is to believe on him whom he hath sent, and again tells us, that he that cometh to him shall never hunger, and he that believeth on him shall never thirst; and again, that his words are spirit and life, but ~~some~~ of them would not believe them: Hereby he fully shews us, that to eat him is to believe and lay hold on him by Faith. As for the Corporal eating we are expressly told, that the flesh thus taken, if it might be so taken, profiteth nothing, whereas taken after that manner that Christ recommendeth to us, it is of such profit that it preserveth the eater from death, and maketh him to live for ever. It is not therefore such an eating with which every man that brings a bodily mouth can receive him, but a spiritual uniting of us to Christ, whereby he dwelleth in us and we in him.

Neither is it in the least necessary that Christ should be bodily present, which were indeed necessary, were our eating corporal or carnal; but being altogether spiritual and supernatural, there is no necessity of his local presence. It is sufficient for a spiritual union with Christ, that he and we, though distant in place, be knit together by that spiritual nexture, which is intimated to us by St. John, namely the quickning spirit, derived from him our Head, to us his Members, and a lively faith wrought by the same spirit, proceeding from us to lay hold on him. That this operation of the spirit is that which constitutes our union with Christ, cannot be doubted by any that will consider, how the Scripture tells us on the one hand, (1.) That Christ is made unto us a quickning spirit. (2.) That he quickeneth whom he will. (3.) That he having received the spirit without measure, we all partake of his fulness. And on the other side, (1.) That he that is joynd the Lord is one spirit. (2.) That we are all partakers of the same spirit. (3.) That hereby we know that we dwell in him and he in us by the spirit that he hath given us. For what can give a more plain evidence than this, that our union with Christ is wrought by the operation of this spirit of his descending from him upon us and working those graces in us, that lift up our souls to take hold on and cleave unto him. The same is also plain from hence, that the Just are said to live by faith, for are we not properly said to live by that whereby we receive our food? Thus Christ dwelleth in our hearts by faith, Ephes. 3. 17.

That this is perfectly the sense of the Church of England, is evident from what I have made appear already in that she teaches, (1.) That the body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Lord's

Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the means whereby

(1.) 1 Cor. 15.

45.

(2.) Joh. 5. 21.

(3.) Joh. 1. 16.

(1.) 1 Cor. 6.

17.

(2.) Eph. 4.

(3.) 1 Joh. 4.

13.

(1.) Artic. 28.

whereby it is received and eaten is faith. And again, (2.) That this marvellous incorporation of Christ with us is wrought by the operation of the holy Ghost (the very bread of our conjunction with Christ) through faith in the hearts of the faithful.

And having thus truly received the body and blood of Christ by faith, and being hereby perfectly united to him, we partake in all the benefits of his Death and Passion, and are put in the possession of these benefits by our first possessing him.

But if still it be pleaded by M. Cendom, that we cannot thus distinguish between the participation of our blessed Saviour, and our participation of the fruits of his Death, unless we distinguish between the participation of his divine body and all spiritual participations by faith, and that if we participate of both spiritually by faith, we cannot participate of them as things distinct. I may, upon good reason, deny his supposition, and say, that we do perfectly distinguish them, and yet participate of both by faith *spiritually*: for what should hinder, but that a man may conceive he partakes of things distinct, and yet partakes of both the same way, as a man eats different meats in one way of eating, but yet discovers them to be different.

If he should yet require me to explain what I mean by *eating* Christ *spiritually* by Faith, he puts me upon a thing very difficult, not because it is not *easily* conceived, but because it is most *obvious* to our apprehensions: for who can by plainer words express what our Saviour means by *hungering* and *thirsting* after righteousness? whereas it is not any difficulty of apprehending his meaning, that makes it thus difficult to be expressed otherways, but that those words are so obvious to our understandings that nothing can better express it to our conception. But however, to give a more full satisfaction, I shall endeavour, if possible, to be yet more plain.

For this purpose therefore I must suppose, That God's *tender* of his Son Christ to us *in the Sacrament* does not greatly differ from his *tender of him to the World*, when he became flesh and dwelt among us, any further than a *general* tender to the whole World from a *peculiar* tender to this or that particular person; and an offer of him, as of one that was sent to be the Saviour of the World from the offer of him, as he has saved us: And I conceive my supposition is not groundless, for if God, out of the abundance of his love, sent his Son into the World, that through him we might *have everlasting life*, and that the World, through him might be *saved*, as the Apostle tells us, *John 3. 16.* and his flesh in the Sacrament be given us, only that we may *live* thereby,

John

John 6. 51. who shall deny but that when Christ is tendred to the same effect of giving us life, these several tenders are only different as a general tender from a particular application? especially when we consider again, that both take effect only in them that believe, as is plain, by comparing *Joh. 3. 16.* with *Chapter 6. 35.* and shall it not then from hence follow, that our receiving him as first tendred by God to the whole World, and our eating him in the holy Sacrament, are of the same nature, preserving only that difference I have premised? if believing be that which makes him ours in both offers, undoubtedly receiving in one respect and eating in the other, are no more than believing in both, still maintaining the difference between Faith, grounded upon a general Promise, and a particular Application. He that shall consider what belief of him was then required, viz. (1.) To know the only true God, and his Son Jesus Christ, whom he has sent. (2.) To hear the Word of Christ, and believe on him that sent him. (3.) To confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in the heart, that God hath raised him from the dead. (4.) To rely on him whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation, through faith, in his blood: may easily resolve what it is to eat and drink the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, namely, that a man does then partake of Christ, when he considers the death of Christ, i. e. the crucifying of his flesh, and the pouring out of his blood, with that faith that supposes all this to be true, and the ends of it to be such as God has declared him to be given for, and by a further consideration of the particular tender of Christ that is in this Sacrament, made to him for all those ends and effects, (if Christ, who is thus particularly tendred, be received by him as he ought to be) is induced to resolve and undertake all which that belief does oblige him to, and with faith, grounded upon that resolution, lays hold on and firmly relies on Christ for those effects, for which he was first given to the World, and is now peculiarly tendred unto him. Then, I say, it is that a man truly eats the flesh and drinks the blood of Christ: and certainly there cannot be found a more exact analogy than is between that nourishment of the body, in the strength whereof it moves, and those reasons whereupon the mind frames its resolutions to direct our conversation: and then God having further promised to communicate his holy spirit to all that out of a true faith resolve upon the doing his will, and as many as have the holy Ghost, having thereby an union with Christ from whom this spirit is derived, have also an assurance that by the holy Ghost, that dwelleth in them, their bodies shall be raised to life

(1.) Joh. 17. 3.
(2.) Joh. 5. 24.
(3.) Rom. 10. 9.
(4.) Rom. 3. 25.

everlasting, Rom. 8. 11. whereby they that eat the body and blood of Christ are united and incorporated into one body with him, and shall not die but have everlasting life.

What then have I fully express'd hereby all that the spiritual eating of Christ by faith implies? no certainly it is not possible to express by words that infinite love of God wherewith he tends his Son unto us in this holy Mystery, nor the mysterious supernatural, but efficacious application of him unto us; nor on the other side, the strength, the vigor, the resolution, the confidence of that faith wherewith the pious soul (transported with that abundant love of God, that infinite and peculiar mercy which it sensibly feels in this Sacred Action) receives, embraces and lays hold on Christ; nor is it possible to express the eagerness and impatience of those appetites wherewith it hungers and thirsts after him, *panting as the Hart after the water-brooks*, till it be satisfied with him, or those transcendent gusts which are tasted in receiving this divine, immortal Food.

But by what I have been able to express, I cannot but think any man may apprehend my conceptions, and how I clearly distinguish the participation of Christ from the partaking of his benefits, the latter not being to be obtained but by first partaking of the former, although all these benefits are indeed obtained so soon as we can conceive a man to have partaken of Christ. And that the Church of England does fully preserve this distinction, appears more evidently by her Thanksgiving after the Communion, which begins thus, *Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy Mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son, and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness toward us, and that we are very members incorporate into his mystical body, &c.*

And hereupon, I conceive, I am enabled to determinate upon what ground he, that eats this bread and drinks this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and eats and drinks his own damnation, although he does not therein eat or drink the body and blood of Christ, for he discerns not the Lords body. For if this was the condemnation when God first sent his Son into the World, that men believed not in the Name of the only begotten Son of God, *John 3. 18.* who can deny but that this shall be the greater condemnation to all that come to this Sacrament, wherein Christ is pleased to make a peculiar tender of himself, requiring every one to receive him, that they have not believed on, nor received the blessed Son

Son of God, who is herein so peculiarly and particularly, so graciously and so mercifully tendred to their reception.

I foresee an *Objection* levelled against the *Doctrine* that I have thus explained, which must be here answered: it is this, That if Christ be only here eaten spiritually by faith, we have many times faith and the spirit of God before, and so might eat him without coming to this Sacrament: To which I answer, The spirit is received in divers measures, and faith bestowed upon us in different degrees, upon which account our conjunction with Christ may every day be made straiter, and our hold firmer. To receive the spirit not by measure, is the priviledge of our Head, we that receive it out of his fulness, must daily look for it to be (1.) supplied unto us. (2.) So also the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith, *i. e.* from one degree and measure of it to another, and consequently we must still labour and pray to him (3.) to encrease our faith. As we have therefore received Christ, so we must walk in him, (4.) growing up unto him in all things which is our Head, from whom the whole body fitly joyned together, and compacted by that which every joynt supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh encrease of the body, unto the edifying of itself in love: and for this end hath God ordained Publick Officers in his Church, (6.) for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: wherefore God hath made them able Ministers of the New Testament, (7.) even Ministers of the spirit that giveth life, (8.) Ministers by whom we believe even as the Lord gives to every man. When we have therefore received the spirit and faith, we must desire (9.) to grow thereby, and as grown men too, we must desire this food of the Lord's Table to continue our strength; of which, being made partakers, the Lord doth grant us (10.) to be strengthened with might by his spirit in the inner man, that Christ dwelling in our hearts by faith, and being rooted and grounded in love may comprehend and know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, and be filled with all the fulness of God.

Hereby therefore all that M. *Condomargues* from the *Doctrines* of the Reformed in this point falls to nothing, that which he urges against those who say the Sacraments are *bare signs*, proves nothing to the prejudice of the Church of *England*, which I have shewn, accounts them to be *Seals exhibitiv*e of the body and blood of Christ. So for the advantage that he builds upon from

the *Gallican Catechism*, which he tells us, teaches; That though Christ be *truly* communicated to us both by Baptism and the Gospel, yet nevertheless it is *only in part*, and *not fully*: I, for my own part, should not stick to say as much; and I presume the reason given above for the necessity of this Sacrament, will abundantly justify me in it, and that I need not, upon this account, be forced to hold any other participation of Christ in the holy Sacrament, than that by spiritual faith. Nor should I stick to say what the *Gallican Confession* does concerning our partaking of Christ's substance, namely, *Although Christ be in Heaven, there to remain, till he come to judge the World, yet we believe that through the secret and incomprehensible power of his spirit he nourisheth and quickneth us by the substance of his body and blood, apprehended or received by faith.* Nor need I by this be obliged to allow the substance of Christ to be otherwise than *spiritually eaten*, or that our union is any other than the participation of his quickning spirit. As little is the advantage he pretends from another thing in their *Catechism*, That the body of our Lord Jesus, offered to reconcile us to God, is now given to assure us of that reconciliation; it having been shewn how our blessed Saviour is truly tendered to that effect in this holy Sacrament, and yet that Christ is to be received spiritually and by faith to that effect; also that with this Doctrine there may be and is an apparent distinction maintained between the participation of Christ and that of his benefits.

Having thus shewn his *Objections* all invalid, I need not enter into a particular discussion of the large Harangue he makes upon them, which is no other than an illusion. But to shew him that is so good at finding out difficulties for us, that we need not seek far to find some for them. Let him resolve us according to their Principles, First, How *Christ* being, as they say, *bodily and wholly* received by them into their bowels, there should be any need of receiving this Sacrament more than once: They cannot use the answer insisted on by us, for that they plead they receive him not by faith spiritually; and to find a way of solving it, they must shew how *Christ*, that is once truly received into their bodies, goes out again. Again, Let them shew us how the body and blood of *Christ*, which being bodily present, is also bodily received and eaten both by good and bad, should turn to the salvation of one, and damnation of the other, when our Saviour saith, *who so eateth his flesh, and drinketh his blood, hath eternal life*, Jch. 6. 54. They cannot say the one eats him spiritually, the other not, since they make the sacramental eating not to be spiri-

spiritual, both therefore eating him *sacramentally*, we are to look for a reason of its different effects. Nay, let them shew us how, when *Christ* tells us *his flesh profiteth nothing*, (which must necessarily be understood, if *carnally* received, according to the gross conception of those that questioned how he would give them his flesh to eat) their eating it, which is no other than taking the *substance* of his flesh *into their bodies* should be at all profitable to eternal life.

S E C T. XIII.

Of Transubstantiation and Adoration, &c.

TO return then, with *M. Condom*, to consider their Doctrine of Transubstantiation and Adoration consequent upon it. I shall not dispute with him whether those species or accidents that remain, supposing, according to their Doctrine, the substance of the Elements changed, be a sign or not. But having shewn, from the plain words of our Lord and evident testimonies of the Apostles, that the sense of our Lord's words infer no such corporal presence of *Christ*, as they suppose, nor any such change of the Elements, as they call Transubstantiation; and likewise shewn all that this Gentleman seeks to prove it by insignificant; I may well conclude the Church of *Rome* has in this point set up a new Doctrine of Faith, even destructive of the Faith, inasmuch as it decrees and commands Adoration, even the honour due to God himself to be given to this Sacrament. Which many of themselves confess to be Idolatry, supposing this first Doctrine of Transubstantiation false.

*Concil Trid.
Sess. 13. c. 5.*

Nor will it signify any thing to say as *M. Condom*, That some of the most learned and intelligent of the Reformed have granted, those who are persuaded of the real presence of *Jesus Christ* in the Sacrament, ought to pay him in it their adorations; who they are that have said so much, I am not concerned to search, possibly some may have said, that if he was indeed really present, as they say, Adoration ought to be given to him: but none, I believe, that all who are persuaded of its being so, ought to pay it him there, so as to imply, that men ought upon a persuasion that may be false to venture upon an action that is Idolatry, if it should be false, without examining the grounds on which they hold such a vain persuasion and destructive

pra-

practice. Questionless we are to adore God wherever he is present, yet to pay our Adorations where he has not assured his presence, though we fondly imagine it, shall not excuse us from Idolatry.

SECT. XIV.

Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Articles of the
the Church of
England.
Article 31.

(1.) Thankgiving
after the
Communion.
(2.) *Ibid.*

Concil. Trid.
Sess. 22. can. 3.

Sess. 22. cap. 1.

Concerning this, the Church of England declares, *Article 31.* *The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation and Satisfaction for all the Sins of the whole World, both Original and Actual, and there is none other Satisfaction for sin, but that alone.* Wherefore the Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priests did offer *Christ* for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous Fables and dangerous Deceits. Nevertheless it must be observed, that she does not stick to call the holy Sacrament, (1.) *A Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving*, (2.) *yea, and to plead before God the Merits and Death of his Son, that, through faith in his blood, we and all his whole Church may obtain Remission of sins and all other benefites of his Passion:* So that she does not deny it to be after some sort propitiatory. Further, She directs us most fully to render our souls and bodies an acceptable Sacrifice to the service of Almighty God.

So that whilst *M. Condom* has thus ambiguously explicated their Doctrine, the difference does not appear so great as really it is; for the Church of *Rome* is not content, if we say, that the *Eucharist* is a *Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving*, or a commemorative Sacrifice, representing that upon the Cross; but requires that we acknowledge it a true propitiatory Sacrifice: and decrees *Anathema* against all that do not own it to be truly such. So that when *M. Condom* tells us from the Council of *Trent*, "That this Sacrifice is instituted only to represent that which was once accomplished on the Cross, to perpetuate the Memory of it, and to apply its saving Virtue for the remission of sins, which we daily commit: All this must be allowed true, and the proper ends of the Institution of the Holy Sacrament: But the Council pleads them "for the Institution of a different thing, "a Sacrifice as distinct from a Sacrament, as is plain in that very Chapter: Which is more fully exprest in the *Catechism*, which teaches

teaches, " That the *Eucharist* was instituted by our Lord for
 " *Two Causes* ; one to be our *heavenly Food*, and to preserve us
 " in our *spiritual Life* ; the other, That the Church might
 " have a *perpetual Sacrifice* for the expiation of Sins. Then it
 " tells us " that these two Ends are greatly different ; the *Sacra-*
 " *ment* is perfected by the *Consecration* ; but the efficacy of the
 " *Sacrifice* consists in its being *offered*. Wherefore the *Eucharist*
 " whilst it is in the *Pyx*, or when it is carried to the Sick, is
 " only a *Sacrament*, not a *Sacrifice*. Again, as a *Sacrament*, it is
 " only *Matter of Merit* to them that receive ; but as a *Sacrifice*,
 " it is effectual both to *Merit* and *Satisfaction* ; for as Christ by
 " his *Sufferings* merited and satisfied for us, so those that offer
 " this *Sacrifice*, merit the *Fruits* of his *Passion*, and satisfy al-
 " so. Hereupon the Council further decrees, "(1.) That this
 " *Sacrifice* be offered as *propitiatory*, not only for the Sins, *Pu-*
 " *nishments*, *satisfactions*, and other *Necessities* of the *Living*,
 " but likewise for the *Dead* that are not thoroughly purged from
 " their *Guilt*. And then (2.) It approves and commends *pri-*
 " *vate Masses*, wherein the *Priest* alone communicates, offer-
 " ing the *Sacrifice* for all the *People*. Thence (3.) It condemns
 " those who say, *it is profitable only to them that communicate*, or that
 " say, *it ought not to be offered for the Sins, Punishments, Satisfactions*
 " *and other Necessities both of the Dead and Living*.

Cat. Trid. sub
 Titulo Euch.
 Sacrif.

Concil. Trid.
 Sess. 22.

1.) Cap. 2.

(2.) Cap. 6.

(3.) Can. 3.

The whole Dispute then ought not to be reduced to the *Real Presence* only, as M. *Condom* would persuade us ; but to these further *Queries*.

First, Upon what ground they make our Saviour in the *Institution* of his *last Supper*, to have instituted it to a *different Purpose* than that of a *Sacrament* ; so as it may be a *Sacrament* to a man when it is not a *Sacrifice*, and a *Sacrifice* *propitiatory* for them that *partake* not of it as a *Sacrament* ?

Secondly, Upon what ground they make this *Action* as a *Sacrifice* distinct from that of communicating, *propitiatory* for the *Quick* and *Dead* ?

Thirdly, Upon what account they attribute a certain *Satisfaction* to this offering of Christ, which a man obtains not by *partaking* of his *Body* and *Blood* in the *Sacrament* ? whereas if all the virtue be by them confessed to be from *Christ's Sacrifice* upon the *Cross*, he that is a *partaker* of *Christ*, must certainly by being so, be *partaker* of *all the Merits and Satisfaction* of his *Death* ?

Fourthly, Upon what ground they warrant their *private Masses* to be *propitiatory* for particular persons whether dead or living,
 for

for whom they offer them, having no warrant from their Christianity to make application of his Merits to them in *this way*.

Nor does any thing said by M. *Condom*, give us the least satisfaction to these Demands; for he shews us but a very insufficient ground upon which he does not doubt but this Action, as distinct from that of communicating, makes God propitious to us, *viz.* "because it represents his Son Christ unto him as crucified. For to ground a Hope, he should have shewn us a *Promise* that God would be propitious upon such a Representation. We doubt not but Jesus Christ presenting himself before the face of God, is powerful in his intercession for us; but what assurance have we that upon every fancied Representation of ours, we can cause him thus to present himself? For presume him present from the *Consecration* we cannot, till the *End* to which his Presence is applied by private Masses, be first shewn to be the *End of Christ's Institution*, and blessing *Bread and Wine* to be used to such a purpose, and after such a way. Nor does M. *Condom* pretend to shew us by what authority his Church warrants the application of this Sacrifice to the Dead that are in *Purgatory-pains*, or to the Living that come not to partake thereof.

View then but this Doctrine which the Church of *Rome* maintains, that as it is a *Sacrifice*, it is more available than as a *Sacrament*, that as a *Sacrifice* it is applied to those who *do not partake of it* as a *Sacrament*, that also as such it is *propitiatory* for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and all other necessities not of the living only, but likewise of the dead: and judge whether this Doctrine does not in effect, yea in reality void the Institution of our Lord, who blessed *Bread and Wine for this only purpose*, that we might *take, eat and drink*, and thereby partake of his Body and Blood; in that it not only lays aside the End of his Institution, but sets up a new Action of a greater value, as is pretended; in that also whilst it pretends to apply the Benefits of Christ's Death by this new means, it takes off the necessity of using that of our Saviour's own appointment, and occasions men to be wholly careless of it, when hereby they are warranted to partake of all his Benefits, and incur not the danger they would if they should come to partake of the *Sacrament* with impenitent hearts; in that likewise it pretends this Sacrifice propitiatory for men after Death, thereby in a great measure voiding the necessity of a Christian Life: especially considering that Doctrine which is commonly taught in that Church, that this Sacrifice avails *ex opere operato*, that all the Benefits of Christ

Christ are derived upon the People by the very *external Work done*, the people not being concerned in or assisting to the Sacrifice, either in their Prayers or participation, and withal their practice of sacrificing for any whatever dying within their Communion, to free them from the pains of *Purgatory*.

S E C T. XI.

Of his Reflections.

BY the Grounds then upon which I have proceeded, I am little concerned with the Explication he gives of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, to shew that their Doctrine of the Sacrifice, ascribing all the virtue wholly to the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, does not impeach or prejudice its efficacy, which the Apostle there pleads. Which if it were granted (as that it cannot well be, for that they have set up a *Sacrifice* which shall make God more propitious to us than the *Sacrament* which does possess us of all the Benefits of Christ's Death) yet this could no way justify them in setting up a Sacrifice representative of Christ's Death to Effects which he had not appointed, pretending thereby to make application of his Sacrifice on the Cross, which he has not warranted them to apply by such means, and to such persons also as they cannot from Scripture warrant it beneficial to.

However notwithstanding M. *Condom* seems to remove all Equivocation in the Word *Offer*, he either still uses it equivocally, or expresses not the Sense of those of his Communion; for *Belarmine* places not the Sacrifice only in presenting to God Christ crucified, but in destroying the Elements that were therebefore, and making Christ present under their Species as dead on the Cross: And the *Catechism* favours this Sense, when it says, *The Priests that sacrifice act not in their own persons, but in the person of Christ, when they make to be present his Body and Blood*: So that if we consider this, especially if joyned with the Doctrine of *Eckius*, that those Representations which the Church makes of Christ as dead, by making his Body as such, to appear before God, and his Blood as separate from it by these Ceremonies that are used in this Action, are the things that constitute the Sacrifice. Against whom *Chemnitzius* disputes so largely from this Epistle to the *Hebrews*: If this be considered, it will be evident that

N

this

in this Epistle was not made use of to such impertinent purpose against them, as this Gentleman pretends.

In his Reflections there is little material for me to consider, the Grounds of all their Doctrine being overthrown. But because he presses it so earnestly, I must take notice of the main thing in it: Here then, he would first persuade us that the main difference between us, is that of the *Real Presence*. This we indeed allow, That their Error in this Point is the Foundation of the Doctrines they build upon it; but this makes it not necessary, that their consequent Doctrines and Practices shall not be judged more prejudicial to Christianity than their first Error. There scarce ever was a Heresie but pretended to deduce all its Errors from some Doctrine that had appearance of Truth, and that did not in itself expressly contradict or prejudice the Faith, though by the progression, they drew from it, the whole Faith has been subverted.

But then he farther argues, " That the *Real Presence* is owned
 " by the *Lutherans*, though they consider not the consequences
 " of it; That the *Calvinists* themselves have declared the *Lutheran*
 " Doctrine to have no poyson in it, and that it does not
 " subvert the Foundations of Faith: That further some *Calvinists*
 " have said, that the *Catholicks* reason better, and more consequently
 " than the *Lutherans*: whence he concludes, *It is an*
 " *established Truth*, that the *Roman* Doctrine in this point contains
 " nothing but the Doctrine of the *Real Presence* rightly understood.
 " An Inference that has not the least coherence with the Premises: Can any man of Sense allow this a rational Argument, The *Lutherans* hold a *Real Presence*; the *Calvinists* say, *There is no Poyson in their Doctrine*; The *Lutherans* admit not such Consequences as we do; the *Calvinists* say we reason better than the *Lutherans*; therefore it is an *established Truth* that *our Doctrine contains nothing but the Real Presence* rightly understood. But to answer it so far as it may seem any way to give him an advantage: The *Lutherans* do indeed hold a *Real Presence* in a Sense different from that I have explained; but then they do not obtrude their Sense upon others as a necessary condition of Communion; so that we may communicate with them without professing their error; nor do they hold such a *Local Presence* as the Church of *Rome*, nor does their Opinion lead them to the Worship of any Creature, nor do they acknowledge any Presence of Christ therein, but only in the act and to the end of his Institution of this Sacrament; and if this has led some to a Declaration that the *Lutheran* Opinion does not subvert the foundation of Faith,

Faith, upon this account that it proceeds not to any further Effects destructive of it, shall this be taken for an acknowledgment that the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, which obliges to such practices upon it as are inconsistent with the Faith, is not such as ought to break communion with her.

And suppose it to have been said that the *Catholics* reason better and more consequently than the *Lutherans*, if it has been said by any of those that allowed Communion with the *Lutherans*, it's manifest, that when they said so, they did not think but that the *Roman* Doctrine was much more inconsistent with Christianity. And that the World may see it is so. I shall transcribe the difference which a *Lutheran* gives us, between the Adoration they tender Christ in the Eucharist, and that which is given by the Church of *Rome*. He places the difference chiefly in two Particulars, "First, that the Church of *Rome* requires that the Sacrament itself, or all that which according our Lord's Institution we receive, should be adored with the honour due to God himself: The *Lutherans* on the contrary, knowing the Sacrament to consist of two things, the one earthly, the other heavenly, direct their Adoration not to the Elements that remain, lest worshipping them, they should be found Worshippers of a Creature, but to Christ alone, God and Man, who in that Action gives them his Body and Blood. Secondly, That the *Romanists* when they plead for the Adoration and worship of the Sacrament, do not principally intend, that Christ, God and Man, should be adored in the Action or Use of his divine Institutions but labour to establish an Adoration of the bread at other times than in the use commanded by Christ, namely, when they carry it about in Processions, (which the Council of *Trent* does in the very Chapter wherein it commands the Adoration of the Sacrament.) And then afterwards he fully informs us of the manner of the *Lutheran's* worship, viz. "That they look not upon Christ as locally present in the bread, or that there is any personal union between the bread and the body of Christ, but that Christ hath promised in that action his presence by his grace after a peculiar manner. Therefore as the *Israelites* worshipp'd not the Wood, nor Gold, nor the Cherubims that were upon the Ark of the Testimony, but God alone who promised his presence there, so the Adoration which they give to Christ in the Sacrament is to be understood to be directed to him only, not at all to the outward Elements. And the reason why they did not worship him out of the Sacramental exercise, he

Gerhard Loc.
Com De sacra
Cena de Vener.

says was, because the promise of Christ's presence cannot be extended beyond the intent and action which he instituted. So that there appears a visible and most considerable difference between these two, the one cannot be Idolatrous, because it directs not any worship to a creature, the other certainly is if the creatures remain, because their worship is terminated in the Sacrament as its object.

Again, whereas M. *Condom* further endeavours to persuade us, "That their Sacrifice is a consequent Doctrine upon the real Presence, and that the *Lutherans* understand not themselves so well as they, in that they have not admitted it. The Reader may judge which have the better understanding, if he does but consider that the reason, upon which the *Lutherans* reject the Sacrifice, is the same upon which they reject Adoration out of the Sacramental Action, namely, because we have no warrant to promise our selves Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, but only in that Action which he commands, and for those ends for which he instituted it: This, I remember, is that which *Chemnitius* pleads at large in his Book *de Sacrificio Missæ*.

S E C T. XVI.

Of Communion in both kinds.

Art. 30.

U Pon this point, the Church of England declares, "*The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-People, for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's Ordinance and Commandment, ought to be administered to all Christian men alike.* And certainly nothing can be more plain from our Lord's institution of this Sacrament (when he blessed both bread and wine, and said, *Take, eat, drink, do this in remembrance of me*) that all that are obliged to any part of it are obliged to the whole: There being not the least limitation of the Lawgiver's intent in the precept itself, nor in any other part of Scripture, nor, which is more, in the practice of the Church originally under the Apostles, or generally throughout Christendom.

Now because we are so frequently desired by these Gentlemen, to take special notice of the first grounds of the separation, I am obliged to take notice here that this was one of the principal causes of it; their with-holding the Cup being that which was universally complained of, that which was most expressly desired and

and Petitioned for, both to Pope and Council, but in vain: We therefore may reasonably expect something satisfactory in this Point.

To answer our expectation, M. *Condom* lets us know, "That under one Species, all that is *essential* to the Sacrament is received, in that there being now no real separation betwixt the Body and the Blood, we receive entirely him who is solely capable to satiate us: And this, he tells us, is the solid foundation upon which his Church, interpreting the precept of Communion, has declared, we may receive the satisfaction which this Sacrament carries with it, under one sole Species, and has reduced her Children to it. But now if this be the foundation she builds upon, and it be solid too, we may well seek for it in the Apostles, or in Christ himself, but certainly neither of these support the building, nay, the foundation which Christ has laid is rejected and laid aside hereby; For to what purpose does this Doctrine serve, but to make it appear that our Lord instituted this Sacrament in *both* kinds to no end, since as much must needs be received in *one* as in *both*?

But whereas he endeavours to ground this Doctrine upon the real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, it's certain, that if he be really present by *virtue* of the *Consecration*, he can be present only according to it; if therefore his words, *This is my body*, make his body present in the bread, and the other, *This is my blood*, render his blood present instead of the wine, then his blood can be no more present in the bread than his body in the wine, neither can any thing more be present under bread than his body, nor under wine than his blood, according to their Principles, which found the necessity of his presence upon the *literal* sense of the words. And to how little purpose has M. *Condom* laboured to persuade us, that it is a *Sacrifice*, because the word of God is the spiritual Sword which makes a *mystical Separation* betwixt the body and blood of Christ? if now at last there be no *sacramental Separation* of his blood from his body, but they are both together under one Species.

"But the Church (says he) has not thus reduced her Children to one Species out of dis-esteem of the other, but on the contrary, to hinder those irreverences which the confusion and negligence of the People had occasioned in these later Ages. Had he told us what Irreverencies had been occasioned, that could not have been prevented but by this means, he had said something that possibly might have shewn the care of his Church; but because he has not been so kind, I shall transcribe the many, and those

*Cat. Trid. sub
Titulo Euch.
Sac. quando
sumend.*

those said to be *great and important*, Reasons which she gives as the account of her so doing to her Children in her Catechism ;
 " First, Because special care ought to be taken that the blood of
 " the Lord be not spilt on the ground, which cannot easily be
 " avoided in administering to a great multitude. Secondly, Because
 " the Eucharist being to be kept for the sick, it was greatly to be
 " feared that the Species of the wine would not keep but might
 " sour ; a thing very greatly to be feared, whilst the *substance un-*
 " *der it is the blood of Christ.* Thirdly, Many men cannot abide
 " the taste nor smell of wine, wherefore that that which was or-
 " dained for spiritual health might not prejudice the health of
 " the Body, it was very wisely enacted by the Church, that all
 " her faithful Children should receive one kind alone. To this
 " may be added other reasons, " That in some Countries wine is
 " scarce, and cannot be gotten without long and tedious Journeys.
 " But that which is *most of all to the purpose*, the Heresie of such was
 " to be rooted out, as declared whole Christ to be under both
 " Species, and said the Body only was contained in the bread and
 " the blood in the wine.

But he further tells us, " That the Church has reserved to her
 " self the re establishment of both kinds, according as it should
 " become more advantageous to Peace and Unity. 'Tis well she
 " has kept to herself a Power of re-establishing that which she ne-
 " ver had Power to dis-establish, but how forward she has been to
 " do any thing towards Peace and Unity, all the World sees by her
 " first occasioning so great a breach by this very thing: And to me
 " her last reason that she gives, makes it evident, that she still main-
 " tains and justifies her Sacriledg, which robs Christians of their
 " Birthright, to the apparent prejudice of Peace, yea, to the ren-
 " dering Unity impossible, unless men will part with their Christi-
 " anity.

But it's most ridiculous, when he comes to conclude from the
 " concession of some Protestants, " That bread alone might be ad-
 " ministr'd, in case a man made protestation of a natural aver-
 " sion to wine ; that therefore, according to the Principles of
 " the Reformed, the matter in question regards not Faith, and
 " so is altogether in the Power of the Church. For without de-
 " termining whether their decision be right or wrong, can it be ar-
 " gued from them that allow the Church may administer it only in
 " one Species, in case of such *necessity*, that therefore the Church
 " has authority to refuse administering it in both wheresoever she
 " pleases to refuse it ? Can it be said, that those who allow her a
 " Power to dispense with *some* in case of *absolute* necessity, do there-
 by

by allow her any Power to prohibit *all People*, who are not comprehended in the case, and being not comprehended, look upon themselves greatly injured by being thus deprived of it? And whereas he infers from hence that it regards not Faith, his argument is as strong, as if because the *Jews* were *not circumcised in the Wilderness*, it should be said the Synagogue might have dispensed afterwards with that Law, and said that Circumcision was not *essentially necessary* to a *Jew*, because in a case of necessity where it could not be used, *Jews* had lived without it.

SECT. XVII.

Of the written and unwritten Word.

“**W**Hereas he says, “That the unwritten Word was the first Rule of Christianity, and when the Writings of the New Testament were added, this did not lose its Authority, so that whatever was taught by the Apostles by Writing or Word of Mouth is to be received with equal veneration, and that it is a sign that a Doctrine comes from the Apostles, when it is universally received by all Christian Churches without any possibility of shewing its beginning: I must not admit it but with these limitations; First, That nothing shall be imposed on us, as a Doctrine coming from the Apostles, but what shall evidently appear to have been *universally received by all Christian Churches without beginning*, and that as *fully to in all the parts of it*, that shall now be pleaded for. For it is in vain to tell us that some things were delivered by the Apostles by Word of Mouth, and those that have been from the beginning so received in the Christian Church universally throughout all Ages and Places ought to be looked upon as such; unless whatever they would have us submit to as *such* be made appear so to be. Secondly, That these Traditions be not acknowledged *of themselves* sufficient to build any *matter of Faith* upon, and this for two Reasons; one, because we cannot have that certainty of these as ought to be had to ground any thing as necessary to salvation; of this all the Scriptures are an evident proof, for undoubtedly the Apostles wrote not any thing to their Churches which they had not by preceding instructions gave them ability to understand; notwithstanding which, we see those instructions are now in great part lost, though the Scriptures are preserved, and they were so soon gone
out

Art. 6.

out of the Church, that in a few Ages after the Apostles, we find men giving them divers interpretations: The other, because we are told, *The Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation, 2 Tim. 3. 15.* which (though spoken of the Writings of the Old Testament, yet since none can deny the Divine Providence to have had the same end in ordering and inspiring the Writers of both, namely, that the Scriptures should be written for our Learning,) is as undeniable a Truth with reference to the New as Old Testament, so that whatsoever is necessary to salvation, must be either contained in or deducible from them. Whereupon the Church of *England* professes, "That Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.

These exceptions which were necessary, in respect of the premises laid down, are altogether needless, if we look to the Conclusion inferred, viz. "That we ought not to wonder if they, being careful to gather all their Fathers left them, should converse the Deposition of Tradition as well as that of the Scriptures. Certainly no man ever blamed the Church of *Rome* for keeping the Tradition she received from the Apostles, but for setting up Traditions that were never deposited with her, much less with the whole Church.

Sess. 4.

The Council of *Trent* indeed, in its first Decree, is very referred concerning Traditions, and speaks cautiously thus, "The Holy Synod (finding Christ's Truth and Holy Discipline, partly in Scriptures, and partly in unwritten Traditions, which either were taken from Christ's Mouth by the Apostles, or were delivered by the Apostles themselves, inspired by the Holy Ghost, and have passed as it were from hand to hand to us, and following the example of the Orthodox Fathers) doth, with the like Religious affection, receive all the Books of the New and Old Testament, as also the Traditions themselves pertaining to Faith and Manners: But under this fair pretence of receiving Traditions either taken from Christ's Mouth, or delivered by the Apostles themselves and passed from hand to hand unto them; they make their Decrees by Traditions of a quite different nature, Traditions of yesterday, such as appear neither always nor universally received, abusing likewise their more ancient to justify all the abuses time and superstition brought in. Thus they pretend their Decree for the Worship of Saints and Relicks, and the use of Images, according to the Tradition or received

ceived Practice of the Catholick Church in the first times, and consent of Fathers, and Decrees of Councils; when yet M. Condom contents himself with Tradition but from the fourth Century, if we would allow it him: And so the Gentlemen do well to plead, that we should receive a Doctrine as coming from the Apostles, when it is universally received without possibility of shewing its beginning by all Christian Churches, thereby to obtrude that which had no beginning in it for three hundred years. Thus they Decree Indulgences to have been in use in the Church in the most ancient times, when yet they could not but be sensible that the use of them was perverted to a quite different purpose from its ancient end; and notwithstanding their desire that they might be restored to ancient Custom, yet we know the Novel is still the modern practice. Thus for Purgatory the Council commands that sound Doctrine be taught concerning it from the ancient Fathers, when no such thing appears either anciently or universally in the Church. And yet at another time, that which Christ himself hath taught, and was delivered both to and from the Apostles, shall not serve to make it necessary. Thereupon it Decrees, "That though Christ instituted the Sacrament under both kinds, "and delivered it in both to his Apostles, yet this does not bind "all men to receive it in both.

Self. 21. cap. 1.

Now then for these men to press Traditions on us when they will neither let us know what nor how many they are, nor prescribe any bounds to them, nor fix any certain Rules to discern them by, nor be obliged themselves to stand by them; and under that pretence, to come now fifteen hundred years after the Apostles and impose on us the single Tradition of one Church, nay, not only her ancient and original Traditions, but Novelties foisted in to maintain her corruptions, and these as we pretend repugnant to Scripture and ancient Tradition: And all this to decline an indifferent Tryal by Scripture, under pretence that all necessary Truths cannot be found therein without recourse to Tradition; if putting on, I say, so fair a disguise to so fraudulent a purpose, they urge this Argument, that the Apostles delivered things by word of mouth which ought to be received, as of any force to oblige us to receive all which they have the confidence to tell us comes from them, What is it but a vain endeavour to impose on the World as if all men had lost common sense and understanding?

S E C T. XVIII.

Of the Authority of the Church.

U Pon this subject M. *Condom* writes after so rambling and confused a manner, that I must first be at the trouble to pick out what he designs to prove, before the solidity of his Arguments can be examined. His aim then I take to be couched in those words, *pag. 45.* wherein he concludes from the Article of our Creed concerning the Holy Catholick Church, "That they oblige themselves to acknowledge an *infallible* and *perpetual* *verity* in the Universal Church. Now herein he has neither expressly told us what this Universal Church is, whether the Church of *Rome* alone, or all other Christian Churches with it; nor whether he means the Church collective, the whole body of Christians; or representative, the Bishops in Council, or the Pope, where some fix this Infallibility. But whereas he afterwards confounds the Catholick Church with the *Trent* Council, which, by her Decrees, if we believe him, has tied herself up, that she cannot make herself Mistress of our Faith; I conceive I may, without offence, determine, that the verity he intends to prove is, that there is an Infallibility resting somewhere in the Catholick Church of *Rome*. To which, if he would oblige us to consent, it had been but reasonable to have fixt this Infallibility in something certain, though, at present, I will not stand upon it, but consider his Discourse, which begins thus:

"The Church being established by God to be the Guardian of Scripture and Tradition, we receive the Canonical Scripture from her, and let our Adversaries say what they will, we doubt not but it is her Authority that principally determines them to Reverence as Divine Books. Which first sentence is a manifest contradiction, it being absolutely impossible that that which is established by God to be the *Guardian* of Scripture, and the *Traditor* of it to others, should be the *Authority* that makes it *Scripture*, which it is before it is put into its Guardianship; and certainly its being *Scripture*, or a Writing of Divine Inspiration, is that which makes them principally revered as *Divine Books*, not that which tells us that they are so.

"But then he gives us instances of Three Books especially, which he conceives received upon that authority, *The Canticle of Canticles*, *St. James*, and *St. Jude*. Where in the first place the

the Gentleman does ill to joyn these together as believed, or to be believed upon the same grounds, the *Canticle of Canticles* being long before the Christian Church, the others since. Therefore I must answer him distinctly. Supposing then that which common sense is able to inform us, that this Book, called, *The Song of Songs*, is more *antient* than the Church of Christ; and that the Church never had, as she has never pretended to have, any express *Revelation*, whether this Book was written by inspiration from God, (as we believe the Law and the Prophets) beside the credit upon which it received it from the Synagogue: it's certain that the only thing questionable, is whether it was received by the Synagogue as divinely inspired; if it appears to have been so received it is not any *authority of the Christian Church*, that has made it Scripture, and if the Church had pretended it Scripture, without evidence of its being received from them, or particular Revelation shewn in the case, it would have been never the more a Divine Book, nor any man obliged to receive it as such. And I marvel the Gentleman should be carried so far by the spirit of Contradiction, and desire to bear down his Christian brethren, as to set up a Principle that betrays our common Christianity, by giving notice to the World that those Scriptures of the Old Testament, whereby the Church pretends to convince the Jews of the necessity of becoming Christians, are not to be received for the Word of God, but upon the *authority of her own Decrees*.

Then for the Epistle of *James*, rejected by *Luther*, and *St. Jude*, by others; nothing can be more manifest to any that will but take the pains to consider it, that the Writings of the Apostles were first kept by and entrusted in the hands of those Churches to which they were sent, as the Epistles to *Corinth*, *Rome*, *Ephesus*, &c. It is therefore reasonable to conceive those Writings so dispersed, when collected into one body, and submitted to by the whole Church, were submitted to upon the certain testimony of those parts of it, wherein they had been kept, those which had not so evident a testimony being laid aside and received only according to the evidence that appeared of their being Divine Inspirations. Nevertheless when they come to be received from the hands of such particular Churches, who knew themselves to have had them from Authors known to be divinely inspired, there might be some expressions in them which might appear not altogether so agreeable with our common Christianity, when they came first to know them, which from the beginning they had not. And this was certainly the case of *Luther*,

in refusing St. *James's* Epistle, notwithstanding the scorns cast upon him for it, as of *Erasmus*, in questioning the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. But yet there is always means of redressing such a mistake either in any part of the Church, or in any particular member of it, so long as there remains means to certify them from what hand they have been received, and how derived from persons in whom the Church was assured the holy Ghost spoke: but to set up the Churches bare Authority for this, is indeed what our Adversaries desire, but what destroys all the nature of the holy Scriptures, and makes them to be believed for another reason than this, that they are the *Dictates of the holy Ghost*.

But in fine he tells us, "It can only be from this authority, that we receive the whole body of the Scripture, which all Christians accept as divine, before their reading of it has made them sensible of the Spirit of God in it. But that there is some little difference between those that are educated in the Christian Church, and others that turn Christians at years of understanding, he might even as well have said, whether the Spirit of God be in it, or not in it. For if the authority of the Church be that which principally determines them to reverence as Divine Books, and upon that authority a man be obliged to receive the whole body of Scripture, before he know the Spirit of God to be in it, he shall, upon the same grounds, be obliged still to hold the same, whether he find it there or not. I am sorry that he thinks all Christians so blind as himself, that they build their belief of the Scriptures, on no firmer a foundation than he seems to do, and am therefore obliged to shew him the ground whereon I build my own belief concerning them.

When therefore I first seek whereon to ground this belief, I enquire after the *Testimony*, not the *Authority*, of the Church, *i.e.* of all those that make profession of Christianity, whose consent I look after concerning the Scriptures; and when I have found what Writings they agree upon and admit for such, the next enquiry is upon what grounds they submit unto them as such, and this I find to be their having received them from former Ages successively together with their Christianity: then must I trace this successive reception of them from one time to another, till I come to those who first received them, and there I find the reason upon which they submitted to them to be the evident proofs which the Writers of them had given to shew themselves inspired by God and commissioned to teach his will, to the obedience of which they ought to give up themselves; whereupon they,

they who had seen God bearing them witness with divers Miracles and Gifts of the Holy Ghost, became obliged, as to obey their Doctrine, so to acknowledge their Writings for the Word of God, they being Records of those miraculous Actions which they saw wrought, and of those Truths which were taught and proved to be the Will of God. And here the very same Motives cause my belief of the Scriptures, which caused those first Christians to receive them, and submit unto them; so that the same reason that moves me to be a Christian, resolves me to believe the Scripture. But if a man shall ask me, since I believe the Scriptures only upon the works done by those Holy Writers which testify them to have had his Spirit, how I am assured that those works were really done? I am not afraid to confess my Belief of this to rely on the Credit of God's People, all Ages of Christ's Church which have born testimony of it successively: so that I submit not my Faith to any Authority that can command it, but I see it reasonable to allow my Belief to the Credit of the Church as so many men of common Sense attesting the Truth of those Reasons which the Gospel tenders why they ought to believe: Neither is my Faith in either of these Respects a humane Faith, but the work of Gods Spirit; for as it is that Spirit only which after I have seen the Motives to Christianity, inclines me to believe, and become a Christian; so it is the same Spirit, which having shewn me the Evidence that the Scriptures were written by the Messengers of God, that works in me an acknowledgment of, and submission to them as the Word of God.

He goes on, " Being inseparably bound as we are to the holy Authority of the Church, by means of the Scriptures which we receive from her hands, we learn Tradition also from her, and by means of Tradition we learn the true Sense of the Scripture: upon which account the Church professes she tells us nothing from herself, and that she invents nothing new in her Doctrines she does nothing but declare the divine Revelation according to the interior direction of the Holy Ghost, which is given to her as a Teacher. I profess all the Skill I have cannot make this hang together. If by his first words he means we are so inseparably bound to the Authority of the Church by receiving the Scriptures from her, that we ought thereupon to receive all that shall be commanded by that Authority; I that have shewn we do not believe the Scriptures upon her Authority as a Church, but upon her *Testimony* witnessing the Motives of Faith, as a number of men that would not

conspire

conspire to testify an Untruth, can never own it to have an Authority of itself to command our Faith. Indeed as we receive the Scriptures upon her Testimony, we learn from the Scriptures that she has an Authority, but such an Authority as perhaps will not content M. *Condom*, which being derived from the Scriptures, can never have power to act against them, and being established only for the Maintenance of Christianity which was before it, can never have power to make that a part of Christianity which was not so before the Church was in being. Then again, though we learn Tradition from her, and that Tradition be useful to interpret the Sense of the Scriptures, yet we receive not any Tradition upon her Authority, as making them Traditions of the Apostles, but upon her Testimony shewing that she has received them from them; and again those Traditions she does deliver, ought not certainly to be received for the Word of God, if not confirmed by the Scripture, because the Motives upon which they were received, cannot be as evident as those of the Scriptures: Questionless no man can deny the Traditions of the *Jews* to be as useful for the understanding the Old Testament, as any now for that of the New; but then it was they perverted the Use of Traditions, when they taught them for God's Commandments.

But that which he infers, from this that has given us both so much trouble, is just nothing, "Upon this account the Church professes, she tells us nothing from herself, and that she invents nothing new in her Doctrine. Whoever thought that their Church ever professed the contrary, or can conceive that any Church will profess otherwise? the question then is not what she professes but what she has done; and let me tell him, that his own words are as great an argument against the Church's absolute and Infallible Authority as any can be given. For if upon the account of her being established by God to be the Guardian of the Scripture and Tradition, and the deliverer of them to her Children, she be obliged to profess, (suppose what may reasonably be supposed, that she be but obliged to act as she does profess) that she delivers nothing new, nothing from herself, nothing but by the interior direction of the Holy Ghost; Shall not her Authority be confined within these limits? Shall she have any power to act beyond them? or if she be accused, as having acted against that Christianity that she ought to have maintained, Shall it not be shewn *de facto* that she has not? or if that seem too apparent, Shall it be pleaded that she is infallible, and cannot have acted against it, though it's visible to all but them that plead so, that she has?

But

But he further tells us, " That there being a dispute raised in the times of the Apostles, the Holy Ghost put an end to it by the Church, and the method then taken by the Apostles, to decide it, has taught succeeding Ages by what authority all other differences are to be ended; so that as often as any divisions shall happen, the Church will interpose her Authority, and her Pastors assembled, will say after the Apostles, *It seemeth good unto the Holy Ghost and to us.* What they will say I know not, I am sure this gives them no warrant to say the like. It's true, this practice of the Apostles has directed the Church upon differences that have hapned, to assemble its Pastors for the ending them; but I see no promise here that they shall have the like assistance with the Apostles, who not only had the Spirit of God at all times in a measure, which no man can pretend to have now at any time, but had likewise frequently immediate inspirations: And if a man should think they had an immediate inspiration upon the place, signifying how they should order the matter, he might have grounds for his opinion very considerable, inspirations being then so frequent even at the common Assemblies of Christians, and St. Paul being so cautious as to *difference* things of his own from the *Commands of the Lord*, although he thought himself at the same time to have the Spirit of God. But whether so or not, no Councils can from hence presume, that the Holy Ghost will lead them into all Truth in whatsoever they take a humour to determine, because Christ promised to send his Spirit to his Apostles to lead them into all Truth, for the teaching and establishing our common Christianity. Father Paul tells us of a Proverb, which perhaps this Gentleman may have known to pass in France, *That the modern Council had more Authority than that of the Apostles, because their own pleasure only was sufficient ground for the Decrees, without admitting the Holy Ghost*; whether verified in this of Trent, I shall not say, but the ground of it is certainly possible, and God, that has promised to lead men by his Spirit into all Truth, has not said he will lead them whether they will or no.

Whereas then he says further, " That when the Church has spoken, her Children will be taught, that they ought not to examine again the Articles so resolved on, but are bound humbly to receive her decisions; and that they are resolved to follow the example of Paul and Silas, not permitting them to be again discussed, but teaching all to observe the ordinances of the Apostles. He would have done well to have shewn us, that the Decrees of the Trent Council are as much the acts of the Holy Ghost

Ghost as *that of the Apostles*, before he had required us to think them act as justifiably in teaching them as *Paul and Silas* did. But by the way, if he speaks this as the fix'd resolution of all their Church *not to admit a new discussion* of what has been decided, but to require all to observe it; he lets us know an excellent Resolution of his Church, and how much it is for her turn that differences in Religion be everlasting.

“ But thus it is, he tells us, the Children of God acquiesce in the Judgment of the Church, believing that from her mouth they hear the Oracle of the holy Ghost. This he should have forbore to have said till he had shewn by something more than he has hitherto, that God has bid his children to hear his Word from the mouth of any Church, speaking without the Scripture, that contains it: but especially methinks he should not have presumed to say, this is the *ground* why in our Creed, having said, *I believe in the Holy Ghost*, we add immediately, *The holy Catholick Church*: if we had no other ground to believe the Holy Catholick Church, than he has hitherto shewn, I am sure we should have but very little for so great an Article of Faith. But no wonder he builds his faith on no better grounds, since he has framed a new sense of the Article, of which, if I convince him by the Catechism of his own Church, I suppose he may be inclinable to hear it: even that then teaches him, “ That the word Church in this Article does chiefly denote the whole number of Believers, including both good and bad, not the Rulers only, but those likewise who are to obey: and if so, I know not how a man is obliged, by believing this Article, to acknowledge any Infallibility in the governours of any Church, or to think that if they err, this Article of our Creed should become false, or that he has ever the less faith in God, if he apprehend or fear least the Rulers of the Church should abuse their power.

*Can. Trid. sub
Titulo. Ecclesia
quibus figuris.*

Whereas after this he endeavours to perswade us, “ That the Catholick Church (meaning that of *Rome*) is so far from making herself Mistress of our Faith, as she is accused, that on the contrary she has done what she could to limit and deprive herself of all the means of innovation, seeing she not only submits herself to the Holy Scriptures, but has obliged herself to interpret them in what relates to Faith and Manners, according to the sense of the holy Fathers, from which she promiseth never to depart, declaring in all her Councils and in all the Professions of Faith she has published, that she does not receive any Doctrine which is not conformable to the

“ Tra-

" Tradition of all preceding ages. If it be really so, that she does in all things thus submit herself, what need he have given us all this trouble to prove that she ought, against his vain endeavours to exempt her from it? Then all that we have depending is only Tryal of Matters of Fact, whether she has really contained herself within the bounds she professes ought to limit her decisions, and this claim of infallibility ought to be by them wholly laid aside; otherwise the World will never believe she has confined herself to bounds that she endeavours to claim a power of exceeding; as I cannot think this Gentleman in conscience knows her to have acted only *within them*, when he takes so much pains to create her an authority *above them*.

But to what purpose does M. *Condom* tell us, " No one prudent man amongst us, but if he found himself the only man of a persuasion, though it appeared to him never so evident, but would be ashamed of that singularity? for is this the case of the Reformed part of the Christian World, are they but as one man? But since he wishes us to consult with prudence, we may desire him to do the like, and consider what prudence it is for a man blindly to give up his judgments to others, and be of a Religion because he has many companions, refusing out of idleness either to examine or come to a tryal of that Religion, or fearing the event of such a tryal, resolving before he enter upon it on a ground from which he will never be dispossessed; such as I have too great cause to fear himself has resolved on, that what he cannot by his skill make good from Scripture and Truth, he will still believe upon the Authority of the Church. And I think this reason (if any thing may be grounded upon humane prudence concerning God's commands) does more evidently shew, that God has never required us to give up a blind obedience to any authority of man; than that given by him that God has set up an authority to which every private man must subject his understanding in all truths, though appearing never so evidently unto him.

S E C T. XIX.

Of the Sentiments of the Reformed about the Authority of the Church.

Although I need not concern my self with several Objections which M. *Gondom* makes from several determinations of Synods in *France*, about the Authority of the Church, yet having shewn the Church to have no such absolute and infallible Authority as he claims for it, I ought to set down the Church of *England's* Sentiments, and consider whether any thing in them is liable to those Objections.

She then supposes, that a Church may err even in matters of Faith, and (1.) declares several to have thus erred: nevertheless she claims (2.) for the Church Power to decree Rites or Ceremonies and even Authority in Matters of Faith; though however it be not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word, nor so to expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another; nor inasmuch as she is a keeper of Holy Writ, ought she to decree any thing against the same, or besides the same, to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation. (3.) And even General Councils may err and have erred even in things pertaining to God: wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

(1.) Artic. 19.

(2.) Art. 20.

(3.) Art. 21.

Now herein you see our Church claims a power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and even an authority in Matters of Faith, but then she confines it so within the limits of God's Word, that she can decree nothing against the same, nor impose any thing besides the same to be believed of necessity to salvation. And herein, till it be proved, that she has exceeded those limits which truth obliges her to own prescribed unto her by God's Word, I see but two Objections that will lie against her.

The first, How, not claiming Infallibility, she claims Authority in Matters of Faith? To which I answer, That God having left means in his Church, when Matters of our common Faith shall become disputable to end and decide them; she, that has proceeded according to those means, may well require submission to her Authority, whilst she shews herself to all to have proceeded aright in the use of those means which God has left

left in his Church, and there is no more necessity that she should be infallible upon this account to make her Authority received, than that she should be able actually and immediately to forgive sins when she requires a subjection to her Ministry in working their cure.

The second, That if she be not infallible in her decisions, then they may be subject to the examination of every private man, and being so, any one may find fault with them, and so a way is open for the introducing as many Religions as men. To which I answer first, That it is one thing to clear the Truth, another to answer an Objection, and if I should not be able to give satisfaction to this Objection, yet the Truth that I have cleared, will stand firm, till the contrary be proved by evident Principles of our Christianity. To this I say then secondly, That it's an Objection of that absurdity, that it can never rationally be used by any considering man. View it but in other instances, a Father may command a Son to do wickedness, the Son certainly is not bound to obey him, though he be to obey his Father; any Son may, under this pretence, refuse obedience to commands just and good, but to avoid this inconvenience, shall it be made a necessary Truth that a Father cannot command an unlawful act? Or go to a greater case, All the World knows we have had a *Leviathan*, that has pleaded, that the Supream Magistrate ought to be obeyed in all his commands; that the Scriptures are not Laws to a People, till the Laws of the Land have made them so; that the sense of them is to be interpreted by the Civil Magistrate; that man may even deny Christ with his mouth, so he believe in his heart at the command or compulsion of his Superior; and all upon this ground, because otherwise if men may pretend any Laws of God to exempt them from obedience to their King, any man may use this pretence, and so under a pretence of conscience all government may be destroyed, unless the commands of the Supream Magistrate be allowed such as are absolutely to be obeyed. Now what answer would a man give to this? Certainly, That the Laws of God are to be obeyed before those of men; that the Christian Religion, though it obliges to obey God, is not destructive of Government, because it commands Obedience to the Higher Powers, that therefore no good Christian can or will make a pretence of Conscience to the prejudice of the Peace, where there is not an absolute necessity, and that he will submit even where he cannot obey. If this be all the answer that can be given, as it is all that ever I understood to be given in this case, yet still there is a *possibility* left for ill men to use a pretence

of Religion to disturb the Peace: and still the like *possibility* will be left and consequently the *Objection* remain in as much force as that *Possibility* gives it, so long as there is a *difference possible* between the Laws of God and those of our Superiours, and no man will have us I hope to avoid this inconvenience, to acknowledge no other God than our Superiours. I say therefore, thirdly, That as every man has a judgment of discretion to chuse his own Religion, so every Christian has the like judgment to consider whether what he submits to the belief of, be consistent with his Christianity. That having undertaken to be a Christian, he is thereby obliged to the Authority of the Church in all cases wherein Christianity requires submission to that Authority, that this having appointed *means by which*, and set her *bounds within which*, and established *ends for which* she is to determine things concerning Christian Truth, he is obliged to give her Obedience whilst she provides in all things for that Christianity that she ought to maintain. But if he shall perceive her in any thing to have acted beyond her Power, or against the interest of Christian Religion, he will consider also, how necessary it is that a man mistake not in a thing wherein Christianity is so greatly concerned *as it is in the Churches Peace*, and will thereupon seek all due and possible means of Information; and if it still appear that the Church requires his Obedience, where his Conscience will not give him leave to pay it, he will endeavour by all the ways of Peace and Meekness to prevail with his Governours to remove the burthen, and will not make a breach but where he cannot comply and hold his Christianity. And whilst both *Governours* and *Governed* shall thus both regard the Laws of him that is the God of all, the one taking faithful care to provide in all things for the maintenance and increase of the Christianity the Church is entrusted to preserve, the other studying in all things the Will of God, and giving thanks to him for so great a help as is the Ministry of his Church, and gladly entertaining what is by her shewn to be his Will from those Holy Writings wherein he has revealed it; What can be more conducing to the establishment of all Christian Truth and Peace?

'Tis true, there still lies a possibility for men, upon pretence of Conscience, to disturb all our Peace; but the same there is of abusing the greatest grace of God. And no man, that will not set up his own wisdom above that of God, can *hope* or *presume*, though every man be bound to *wish* and *endeavour* a *final end* of all Controversies in Religion, the Apostle having told us, (1.) that there *must be Heresies*, and our blessed Lord, (2.) that *Offences will*

(1.) 1 Cor. 11.
19.

(2.) Luke 17.

will come, though he denounces a woe to them through whom they come. Nor ought this any more to be cast as a Reflection upon those, who, as much as is possible and as much as in them lies, labour after Peace, only resolving to hold the Truth; that through the wickedness of some they cannot accomplish what they so earnestly pray for and endeavour after: than it ought upon our Christian Religion that it is destructive of Civil Government, because some have abused it, as a pretence to subvert and disturb it. No man certainly dares think our Saviour to be ever less the Prince of Peace, or ever the less sincerely desirous of it when he left it as his peculiar Legacy to his Disciples; for that out of a foresight of the unhappy Divisions of the Christian World, he tells us, (3.) That he came not to send Peace on earth, but a sword to set the father against the son, and the son against the father. (3.) Matth. 10.34.

All that M. *Condom* objects from the Actions of the *Gallican Synods* falls within these two Objections which I have answered, I shall not therefore lengthen this Tract by a particular application, there being nothing of moment but what may without difficulty be solved by one or both of these answers which I have given to that therein, which seemed to be of force against the Doctrine of the Church of *England* in this point, whose cause it is that I have undertaken.

S E C T. XX.

Of the Authority of the Pope.

WHereas M. *Condom* asserts the Popes Authority from the Primacy invested by our Lord in *St. Peter*, and the acknowledgment of this Primacy by the Holy Councils and Fathers in the Pope as *St. Peter's* Successor: I need only deny that, which he asserts without proof, and am not obliged to evidence by any proofs that he has no such Authority, 'till I am shewn what obedience is claimed by or given to him, and his title and right thereto.

Their Profession of Faith is thus, "I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolick Church of *Rome* to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches: And I vow and swear true Obedience to the Bishop of *Rome*, the Successor of *Peter*, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ. This Supremacy the Church

*Profess. Fidei
Pii Quarti.*

(a) Hom. for
Whitsunday.
Part 2.

Church of *England* denies him to have any title to, (a) as touching that they will be termed Universal Bishops and Heads of all Christian Churches through the World, we have the Judgment of *Gregory* expressly against them, who writing to *Mauritius* the Emperor, condemned *John* Bishop of *Constantinople* in that behalf, calling him, *The Prince of Pride, Lucifer's Successor*, &c. and again, (b) *The Bishop of Rome* bring by the order of *God's Word* none other than the Bishop of that one See and Diocese, and never yet well able to govern the same, did by intolerable ambition challenge, not only to be Head of all the Church dispersed through the World, but also to be Lord over all Kingdoms of the World.

(b) Hom. against
Rebellion. Part 5.

Although he is pleased to wave those things that are disputed in the Schools concerning this extravagant Power and Authority of the Pope, as not being Articles of the Catholick Faith; I must tell him, it would have removed great jealousies, if, as he has declared them not Articles of the Catholick Faith, so he had owned them to be false. For, as the case stands, though they be not yet, they soon may, by those who make Articles of Faith of any thing they have a humour to determine.

Men may love *Concord* amongst Brethren, and yet love *Truth* among Christians, and those that love them both must not vainly give away the later to seek the former by ways not established by God. And the Advertiser certainly thinks his own experience has taught him more wisdom than all the rest of the world, when he would by that convince us that the Authority of the Pope is the only means of Christian Concord, when experience has taught others that it's the ready way to destroy our common Christianity. And though the Church ought not to rise in Rebellion against a power that maintains her unity under pretence that some have abused it; yet undoubtedly it may reject an usurpation begun with fraud and encreased by violence, which it sees to be no establishment of God's, and has experienced destructive of his truth.

As for Episcopacy (blessed be God) our Church has been able to preserve it with great advantage to our Christianity. Those of the Reformation in other parts, who had not the like power nor the same opportunity of doing it, being yet obliged to provide for their common Christianity, though they could not bring to effect, in all things, the establishment of his Church, I doubt not but God may and does bless in the exercise of his Ordinances.

T H E CONCLUSION.

Hereby therefore it appears, that M. *Condom's* explication has given us but a very unsatisfactory resolution, the greatest part of the Objections being still left in full force, and their Doctrines shewn some necessarily, and others very probably, others absolutely to subvert the foundations of Faith; which abundantly justifies that Provision made by the Reformation, and makes it absolutely necessary that they let not go that Provision, which the maintenance of our common Christianity rendred at first, and does still require necessary.

Neither has M. *Condom* mentioned all the material Points in difference: Two I am sure there are omitted, as considerable as many by him taken notice of. One is the Decree of the Council, which requires the Scriptures, which we call *Apocrypha*, to be admitted with like reverence as the unquestionable Canonical Scriptures, and to be received as all of one rank, which before had never been enjoined but with that difference which had always been acknowledged in the Church. Which Act, giving to them the authority of Prophetical Scripture, inspired by God, which they had not before, though it be thereby null in itself, (because what was not inspired by God to him that wrote it, can never become inspired by him, and that which was not at first received as such, can never be known to be such without special Revelation) yet usurpeth an Authority which was never heard of in the Christian World, and claims a submission which a Christian cannot give to any but such as shall prove themselves to have had an immediate Revelation in the case. The other is their Decree, that the Service of God be not performed in the vulgar Tongue: For if the People be obliged to assist in that Service, (which if they are not, To what purpose do they assemble?) then certainly the Offices in which they assist ought to be understood by them. Possibly they will say, that *Unity* is preserved by the universal use of one Language, though the Service of God be not understood; but then the *end*, for which it should be preserved,

ved, is not accomplisht, when the Service of God is not, nor can be performed as Christianity requireth, by those who understand it not.

Besides, it is observable, that it's M. *Condom's* way to take these Points *single*, and spend all his pains in extenuating them as much as possible, that they may not appear absolutely to destroy our Christianity, and then to press us to compliance with it: But he never looks upon them *together*, nor considers, whether with that care of our common Christianity which all ought to take, they can be *all* complied with and submitted to.

I then have shewn even in the Particular wherein I have gone along with M. *Condom*, That the Invocation of Saints is without warrant from our Christianity, has no Promise of any Grace or Mercy, yea tends so greatly to the prejudice of Christianity, that it shall be very difficult for a Christian to preserve himself from Idolatry in the use of it, and which Experience has shewn to have been Idolatrously practised by many: That the Use of Images again, is no way necessary in God's Worship, but dangerous, and makes it most difficult to avoid that Idolatry which many have really committed in the use of them: That the Relicks of Saints have no such virtue by any divine Promise as they are frequented for; that the Church therefore ought not to teach or perswade People to frequent them for such Aid or Helps, since their recourse to them has been experienced to have brought forth much Superstition, advancing Peoples Devotion to Saints, to the prejudice of that they should preserve for God alone: That their Doctrine of Justification involving a mistake in the very nature of it, by making *Inherent Righteousness* the formal Cause of Justification, gives too great appearance that they claim Remission of Sins as due to that *inherent Righteousness*; whereas it is only the effect of Christ's Merits: That likewise by their *Anathema's* they have condemned those who hold the Truth in this Point: That in the Point of *Merit*, if the Doctrine of the Council be not expressly, yet that vulgarly taught in that Communion, is contrary to the Faith, and injurious to Gods Grace, which Doctrine is favoured by the very words of the Council; that herein also they condemn those who assert the Truth, and desire to magnifie God's Grace: That their Doctrines of *Satisfactions*, *Purgatory* and *Indulgences*, are built on a foundation that has not the least ground in holy Scripture, their *Satisfactions* being enjoynd to other ends than those in which they take place in Christianity; being also according to the purposes by them used injurious to the Merits of Christ, and offensive

offensive to their Christian Brethren ; their *Indulgences* granted to unheard of purposes and perverted from their primitive use ; their *Purgatory* a vain invention, and the occasion of much Superstition ; and these, taken together with their *Absolution* in *Penance*, tending directly to the manifest prejudice of our Christianity, since the Pardon of Sins is presumed to depend not upon *Reconciliation* wrought with God before, but on the *Power of the Keys*, as the ground of it, whereby Absolution is pronounced before the Church has done any thing to work the Cure of Sin, and the Penances afterwards imposed for the satisfaction of a temporal punishment, the Sin being to be supposed pardoned before, and no eternal punishment to remain due, and those to be expiated by some easie satisfactions in the present Life, or to be abated in Purgatory by some Indulgences purchased here, or Services performed by their Friends afterwards ; whereby simple Souls must necessarily be entangled in the Snares of their Sins, there being so great likelihood, that Pardon being held forth upon such undue grounds, the corruption of our Nature will take hold of and presume upon it, when we have not wrought in our selves a true Repentance : That in those things which they call *Sacraments*, they will not suffer us to distinguish either in that Grace which the Ceremony signifieth, or in the Force whereby they concur to the obtaining of it ; whereas our Christianity requires us to distinguish between Graces given to this or that particular effect, and those that are given for the general and perpetual subsistence of Christianity, and likewise between those Offices that are effective of Grace by virtue of a peculiar and special promise to those effects, and others that are only used by the Church, out of a hope that our Prayers shall be heard to those effects : That they conceive Christ present in the *Eucharist* after such a manner, as it does no way appear he promised his Presence therein ; that hereupon it is required that Adoration due to God alone, be given to the Sacrament, which if the Elements remain, is by themselves confessed to be Idolatry, and therefore may justifiably by us, who know them to remain, be so accounted : That without warrant they make the *Eucharist* a Sacrifice as distinct from a Sacrament, and of a greater virtue as a Sacrifice, than when it is received as a Sacrament, according to our Saviour's Institution : That they warrant it propitiatory for those who use it not according to his Institution, whereby they frustrate the End of his blessing Bread and Wine, and commanding it to be received, and likewise void the necessity of a Christian Life, applying the

Q

Benefits

Benefits of Christ's Sacrament to such as come not worthily to partake of it, and pretending it efficacious to ease them of punishments which they are to suffer for sins after Death: That whilst they with-hold the Cup from the Laity, they void Christ's Institution, who enjoyed and appointed both, they likewise rob Christians of their Birthright, and cannot warrant one part of this Sacrament beneficial to all those effects for which Christ was pleased to bless both Bread and Wine: That whilst they plead for Traditions, they thereby endeavour to obtrude upon us their own Corruptions, and by these, instead of interpreting, pervert the Scriptures, and by Traditions of men have indeed in many things made void the Comandments of God: That by claiming an Authority for the Church above the Scriptures, which they do to justify what the Church of *Rome* has decreed against them, they do indeed advance an Authority that may destroy our common Christianity: That in pleading their *Pope* universal Bishop, not to speak of their Ambition in this Aim, they require us to submit to an Authority for the sake of Unity, which is not only none of God's Ordinance, but such as Experience has shewn to have almost wholly destroyed that Christianity which Unity should preserve. Having shewn, I say, the danger of these Doctrines in particular, and their inconsistency with Christianity, when I reflect upon them all together, and find that our Union with the Church of *Rome*, requires submission to them all, must conclude that whatever allowance might be made in some one of them (provided that the rest of that Christian Truth which they hold, did so prevail over the Error, that it did not take effect in their practices to God's Dishonour, or the subversion of a Christian Life) yet to submit to them all, as we must do if we will have peace with the Church of *Rome*, is to redeem the Communion of the Church by transgressing that Christianity which the Church is appointed to maintain, and absolutely to prostitute our own and the Souls committed to our Charge.

The Case is little otherwise in those other things which *M. Condom* lets alone as things of themselves not sufficient matter of Separation; these if taken together, though singly they may not be very considerable, render the Means of Salvation very difficult; since the Substance of Christianity being overwhelmed and choaked with a deal of Rubbish Opinions, Customs, Observations, Ceremonies, &c. it is a thing very difficult for simple Christians to discern the Substance from the Shadow, and almost impossible to pass through such a multitude
of

of Observations, Customs and Ceremonies, which create so much business in the Practice of Religion, and upon which so great Zeal is spent, without Superstition and Will-Worship, and a fond Opinion of those Services, placing their hope of God's Favour upon these carnal Observations and humane Inventions, which indeed are nothing to the Reality of Religion. So that these at least must be allowed to add to that Mass of Corruption which they seek to obtrude upon us, though of themselves they are not of such a poisonous Nature.

But though we cannot joyn with them without manifest prejudice to our Christianity, yet it is most easie for them to come to us, and would be for the great advantage of our Christian Religion, as even themselves must and do acknowledge.

For first, Those Doctrines which are established by the Church of *England*, at least such as concern the Foundation of Faith have been in all Ages professed by the Church of *Rome* itself. This *M. Condom* allows as to Fundamentals, "That the Church of *Rome* holds all which the *Reformers* do. They further agree with us, "That we are to pray unto God through Christ: That God may be worshipped in Spirit without an Image: That we may have recourse to him in all our Necessities without seeking the Relicks of Saints: That Jesus Christ is the meritorious cause of our Justification: That men may do good Works, and shall never fail of Salvation through not confiding in them: That there be two Sacraments which have the Promise of Grace. That Christ is really and spiritually received by some in the Lord's Supper: That Christ made an Oblation of himself upon the Crofs for the Redemption, Propitiation and Satisfaction of the whole World: And where they withhold the Cup from the Laity, and forbid the Administration of the Sacraments in the vulgar Tongue, yet even in these they condescend to us for the Lawfulness of the Practice, even in respect to the Law of God, and oppose them only in regard of their necessity and conveniency, and for that the Church of *Rome* hath otherwise ordained: They acknowledge likewise the Authority of written word of God, and the Design of Providence in their being written for our Learning: They acknowledge the Church does and ought to act in deciding Controversies of Faith according to the Scripture committed to her, and to tell us nothing from herself, and invent nothing new in her Doctrine.

Again secondly. The Truths we hold (even by the judgment of several of the Learned Writers of the Church of *Rome*) have been in all ages deemed sufficient for salvation; so that we re-

ject no Doctrine, the explicit Belief whereof is absolutely necessary. For first, *in respect of Knowledge*, the Schoolmen hold, " That much less is needful to be explicitly believed, than what is contained in our Doctrines. For whereas we entertain and embrace not only the Doctrine of the three *Creeeds*, but also sundry other Truths, as appears by our *Homilies* and *Articles*, they declare it needful to believe, some but the whole Creed, others, the *Nicene* and *Athanasian*, joyned with the *Apostolical*, to make a man a compleat Believer; and this, although we go no further than the proper Sense of the words, and have no great distinct knowledge of the Matters; whereof however there is none will deny but the Church of *England* has a perfect understanding, as also a right apprehension of them according to their true Christian Sense, in which the whole *Christian Catholick Church* ever understood them. Secondly, *For Practice*, they grant, " That we may obtain Salvation without undergoing such Duties as we refuse. For if one worships God without an Image, they do not deny this worship to be acceptable: If a man pray immediately to God through Christ, they will not say this Devotion is fruitless: If one perform the best works he can, (which we also require) and stand not upon their Merit, but only upon the Mercy of God, as we do, they judge it to be not only profitable, but also commend it as most secure. They deny not but sometimes true Contrition does obtain Pardon without Penance, or the Priest's Absolution. They cannot deny but that to receive Christ spiritually in the holy Sacrament, is sufficient to all the Effects of it; for the *Council* places the difference between those that receive it worthily, and those that receive it to their own destruction, in this, that the former receive him both sacramentally and spiritually; the other only sacramentally. Nor I suppose will they deny, that he that relies only on Christ's Sacrifice on the Cross, has a sufficient expiation for Sins, whilst he confides only in him whom God hath set forth to be our Propitiation: Nor that we receive the Sacrament aright when we communicate in both kinds. Likewise if a man believes no more than is contained in the Scriptures, they confess him to believe as much as is necessary and profitable to all men. And if a man submits to the Authority of the Church in all things which she acts for the maintenance of that Christianity she ought to preserve, whilst she acts according to God's Word, and her own Commission both given and limited by it, they cannot say, I presume, that such a man disowns her Authority, or voids Gods Ordinance, or that the Church, which professes herself to have

*Bellar. de Ju-
rif. l. 5. c. 7.*

*Concil. Trid.
Sess. 13. cap. 8*

no other Authority, but acts according to this which is given her of, and limited by the Scriptures, does not do what she ought for the maintenance of Christianity, and discharge of her Trust.

Again, Thirdly, The Doctrines which we disown, were not received as Articles of Faith, nor the contrary judged heretical by the Church of Rome for many hundred years after Christ. For (a) that Church held at first, by our Adversaries own confessions, all things which the Apostles used to preach openly, and which were necessary and profitable for all men, to be contained in the Scriptures. (b) Even the Popes themselves disowned the Title of *Universal Bishop*; neither has that Church as yet decreed itself *infallible*, though pretended by her Champions so to be. (c) Neither did they anciently worship Images, or approve the Image of God to be made; nor does any worship of Saints appear therein for 300 years after Christ; and it grew therein by degrees, and came in by custom, says Bellarmine. (d) Wherein *Purgatory* for a time was not known, nor for a long time after resolved which way it concerned Salvation (e) either in regard of the Persons thereby to be purged, whether the damned, justest, or middle sort, or in regard of the Ends and Effects which it hath, whether to satisfy God's Justice by punishing Sin, or to diminish and take away the Affections of Sin yet remaining, by corrections and chastisements. Wherein (f) *Indulgences*, as now practised, were not known, nor any instance of them till a thousand years after Christ, wherein *Transubstantiation* was not heard of till the Council of *Lateran*. Wherein a thousand years after Christ and more, the Sacrifice in the *Eucharist* was said, (g) to be only a Memorial and Representation of our Saviour's Sacrifice upon the Cross: wherein the Cup was administered to the Laity, and the Priests received not the *Eucharist* alone, but together with the People.

Further, It's evident that we run no hazard, neither do we venture upon any dangerous practice, but walk in the safe way to salvation. There is no danger in offering our Devotions to God through Christ, and to him only, as there is in the worship of Saints, which is not only without warrant, and most likely to be offensive to God, but is even Idolatry if a right distinction be not always preserved, which is very difficult to be preserved at all times: nor in omitting the use of Images, nor in having recourse to God's Providence only leaving the Reliques of Saints; as is confessed to be, if the use of Images seduce us to believe any divinity or vertue in them, to place any trust in them or hope any thing from them. Nor is there any danger in relying

(a) Bellarm. l. 4.
de Verbo Dei,
c. 11.

(b) Greg. Patriarch Alexan.

(c) Bellarm. de
Imag. l. 2. c. 9.

(d) Bellar. de
Sanct. Beat.
l. 1. c. 8.

(e) Bell. lib. 2.
de Purgat. c. 1.

(f) Bell. l. 2.
de Indul. c. 17.

(g) Aquin. par.
3. quest. 83.
art. 1.

on

on Christs Merits and God's Mercy for the Remission of our sins, not depending upon our own works, but doing what we are able in obedience to God, and after all, saying we are unprofitable servants, vilifying ourselves, but magnifying the grace of God ; as there may be in trusting to our own Righteousness. Nor in requiring Contrition as absolutely necessary to the Remission of sins, as there is if we content our selves with less. Nor whilst we reject the Adoration of the Sacrament, so we offer up our souls to Christ in Heaven, as may be in worshipping the Sacrament, which themselves confess to be Idolatry, if the opinion of Transubstantion be false. Nor in not relying on the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, but frequenting it as a Sacrament with due preparation, nor in receiving it in both kinds, according to Christ's institution ; as may be in supposing it beneficial, when we use it not according to Christ's institution, which obliges us to partake of it as a Sacrament, and in withholding part of it when it does not appear that he has left any such power in the Church to minister but a part of what he commanded. Nor in chusing the Scriptures for a Guide, so we sincerely follow them ; as there is if Tradition should lead us, as it did the *Jews*, to void the Commandments of God. Nor does that Church run so great a hazard, which owns the limits that God has set her, and acts according to them, as the Church that having acted against our common Christianity, or at least being accused so to have done, claims an absolute and infallible authority to justify what she cannot defend by God's Word.

There are but two things wherein they possibly can object to us any hazard or danger that we incur. One is, That, if the Church be not acknowledged Infallible, and all obliged to an Absolute submission, a way is open for men, under this pretence, to cast off her Authority and set up Religions according to their own fancies. This I have shewn we labour to prevent so far as the Divine Providence has appointed means for its prevention, and we think it not safe to set up others of our own invention, which may be liable to equal or greater mischiefs another way. Nor that it is as certainly probable, on the other side, That, by advancing an absolute and unlimited Authority of the Church, our common Christianity may be destroyed by Decrees, that may be made, which may subvert the foundations of Faith, cannot be doubted ; but must needs be evident to all that know it possible for men to be led by their own Interests or Opinions, and have also actually seen by what interests late Councils have been managed and swayed in their Determinations, whereby
men

men of good intentions have not been able to bring to pass what they intended and endeavoured for the good of Christianity, being overruled by a greater number of men prejudiced and less considerate, which has been confess'd even by sincere men of the *Roman Communion*.

If they tell us, That, according to our Principles, the Churches Authority is insignificant, it being in every man's power to reject it, so that it is a very insufficient means for Peace, such as became not the Divine Wisdom to constitute, because not certain to take effect: Not to repeat what is said before, *Section 19.* but only to shew them how unreasonable it is that they should require us to shew the Reasons of the Divine Providence in its Constitutions that are evident to us, when the Reasons of them are not. Let them resolve us, if the Scriptures be not our Rule of Faith and Manners, or if we cannot understand the sense of them without the Churches Authority, why they were written, or if the Churches Authority be absolute and unlimited, why it had not been plainly and expressly told us by God, that we must submit our selves in all things to this Authority; or why we are bidden to search the Scriptures, why God should have suffered the Scriptures to be written, when he could not but foresee that the pretence of the Churches Authority, clashing with that of the Scriptures, is that which has and will disturb our Peace.

If they tell us of the many Heresies, Schisms and Divisions that are seen to have saln out by mens expounding the Scripture for themselves: They will give us leave, I hope, to tell them of the Idolatries, Superstitions, and other Irreligious Customs and Practices, which we see to have fallen out through their exalting the Churches Decrees to the prejudice of Christianity. And further, that as to those Heresies and Divisions which we see and lament among our selves, we are beholden to the Church of *Rome* and her Emisseries in great part for them, who have endeavoured to ruin our common Christianity by another extream, only because we would not yield to those things which they have first done to the prejudice of it. Besides, I am apt to think, that even such will have a great Plea at the day of Judgment from the rigoroufness of the Church of *Rome* extending the Churches Authority beyond all bounds that our common Christianity will allow, and necessitating well-disposed Christians to refuse submission to it: whereby it becoming visible, that Christianity is not in all things maintained by the Church necessarily, and it not being evidently visible to common sense, what bounds
being

being kept, her Authority does by God's Law claim submission, they have presumed upon their own understandings for the sense of the Scriptures, and framed their Religion according to them. This I only urge, that they may look about them, lest they become guilty of the many souls that may miscarry in both extreams; whilst they have rendred the means of salvation difficult among themselves, and have, by pretending to justify that, occasioned others to oversee the due means they should betake themselves to, and run as dangerous a way in the other extream.

So then we are altogether as safe, yea, much more secure than the Church of *Rome*, for we take that way to confute Heresies and to preserve the purity of Faith, which the Divine Providence has appointed, appealing to the Scriptures, and using the best means for the understanding them, and declaring the Authority of the Church acting within the limits set her by God's Word, and for the maintenance of that Christianity she is established to preserve. They on the contrary pretending to maintain their Church in what she has decreed to the prejudice of Christianity, seek to establish a Power that has already prejudiced even in the foundations of Faith, and may in probability utterly subvert our Christianity, and have thereby given occasion to others to place their Reformation of the Church in the utter renouncing her Authority. Nor are they ever the nearer putting an end to Heresies hereby, for all their pretences to Infallibility will never end the differences of those that disown it; and yet it's apparent, that in the mean time they prejudice our common Christianity by those Laws which make the means of salvation very difficult, if not altogether ineffectual by denying, hitherto, those helps to salvation, which those Laws intercept.

The other danger which they pretend we run, is that of Schism, a great crime questionless, and that which all Christians ought not only to lament but seek to remedy, and if it be possible, and as much as in them lies, to follow after Peace which by so many obligations the Christian Church is bound to preserve. But we know that both Parties are liable to be charged with the breach, till it appear which is guilty, and the guilt of it will certainly fall on those who have made the separation necessary; so that if a Church requires such conditions of Communion, which are inconsistent with Christianity, and subvert the Faith it ought to preserve, they certainly are to be charged with the Crime, who will not suffer us to hold our Christianity, together with the Churches Communion. Besides there is nothing of this Charge can lye against

against the Church of *England*, 'till they prove her either to have rejected any Authority to which she was legally subject, or to have departed from the Faith by her Reformation. But the Church of *Rome*, if she pleases to reform herself, need not fear this Crime, she may remove those Laws that prejudice the salvation of the Members of her Communion, establish those for herself that tend to the exceeding benefit of Christianity as well as the Peace of Christ's Church, and thereby provide for the Purity of Faith and Unity of the Church withal. And I see no reason why the Church of *England* (being a part of the Church Catholick, but no way subject to the Church of *Rome*) may not adventure to desire them to consider the things that belong to their own Salvation as well as the Peace of Christ's Church, and how much they are concerned and obliged by all the commands and bonds of Unity that are obligatory upon Christians, as to lay aside their claim to an Authority over all the Churches of Christ, which is not given them of God, and which they chiefly challenge to maintain what they cannot otherwise defend, so especially to reform all those Customs, Laws and Practices that have been experienced prejudicial to the Faith, and establish such as may advance and promote it, since by doing this which is otherwise their duty, they may procure that, which themselves pretend so earnestly to seek, and which we acknowledg and pray for as the greatest blessing next to Purity of Faith, the Peace and Union of the Church of Christ.

R

Refle-

Reflections upon his Pastoral Letter.

THere can be but two aims, as I apprehend, in dispersing this Letter among us; one to persuade us that there is no such Persecution of Protestants in *France* as is pretended; the other, that the Reasons upon which such multitudes are Profelyted to the Church of *Rome*, or those at least which *M. Meaux* gives in this Letter are so convincing, as to oblige the rest of the World to follow their example.

What he affirms in relation to the first, that *not one among them had suffered violence either in Person or Goods*, is so notorious a falsehood, that I may leave *all those* to believe him *that can*. For none certainly can admit the belief of it, but such as can force themselves to believe against all the evidence of their senses and reason.

Waving this therefore, I shall content myself to examine the main thing that concerns us, Whether there be any thing of *solidity* in the motives he gives to confirm his Profelytes. Though herein I shall not concern myself with what particularly relates to the *French* Protestants, or with any advantages that he may seem to have over them, but only with such as may be supposed of equal force against the Reformed Church of *England*: my business being only to oppose the design that seems aimed at in their dispersing this Letter among us.

The first thing considerable, is what he says, *pag. 4. That himself and his other Colleagues have this glory which they will not suffer to be taken from them, that they have never condemned their Predecessors, and Preached no other Doctrine than what they received from them: Whereas the Bishops of England, &c. at their going off from the Church of Rome, manifestly renounced the Doctrine of their Predecessors.* Now no man will envy them this glory, that they have *obstinately* retained those *Errors and Corruptions* which their Predecessors had admitted: The glory of the Bishops of *England* is this, that having *purged* themselves from those corruptions which time, and superstition, and base intrests had brought into the Church of God, they now retain the *Doctrine of the Apostles and Primitive Christians*, from which the *Romanists* pretending to follow their Predecessors are greatly deviated.

For though *M. Meaux* has the face to say, *That we cannot produce*
any

any one instance of a change in Doctrine, and that those changes we pretend are rightly called Insensible, because we cannot make them out : Yet the pitiful defence he has made for his Church in those particulars wherein we charge them with Innovations, does sufficiently shew them to be such ; and the inconsistency of those Doctrines with Christianity does likewise evidence, that though they may have been called insensible changes, because insensibly introduced, yet now they are visibly and palpably destructive of the Faith.

It's true indeed, as he says, *The succession of Pastors and Doctrine ought not to be separated ; and, blessed be God, our Church of England, as it now holds the Christian truth in the Purity of it, has also enjoyed as uninterrupted a succession of Pastors as any Church whatever.* But the Romanists pretences to a succession of Pastors is vain, so long as the Christian Doctrine is not preserved entire, which an uninterrupted succession of Pastors proves not to be so preserved, whilst there is a possibility for those Pastors to admit Innovations agreeable to their own Opinions or Interests.

The next considerable thing that he urges, is the Authority of St. Cyprian, from whom he cites several passages pretended to conclude us under a necessity of holding Communion with the Church of Rome, and to render all that separate from it guilty of Schism. Wherein, since he blames others for not taking his Doctrine entire, he ought to have been sincere himself, and not have caught up fragments of him here and there to adorn his deceitful discourse.

In the first place cited, St. Cyprian does indeed say, *That to manifest the unity of his Church our Saviour said to Peter single, Thou art Peter, &c.* but he says likewise, *That he gave to all his Apostles equal power ;* but this M. Meaux thought best to leave out. His words are, *The Lord said unto Peter, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, &c. and I give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and also after his Resurrection feed my Sheep. He builds his Church upon Unity : And though he gave to all his Apostles equal power, saying, As my Father sent me so send I you, &c. yet that he might manifest the Unity, he dispenses his Authority to one as the original of Unity.* That therefore which Peter was, the same were the rest of the Apostles, joined in the same fellowship of Honour and Authority, but

& ceteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti & honoris & potestatis sed Exordium ab unitate proficiscitur ut Ecclesia una monstretur. Cyp. Lib. de unitate Ecclesie.

Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum Ego tibi dico, quia tu es Petrus, & super istam Petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam & portæ inferorum non vincunt eam. Et tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum, &c. Et iterum eidem post Resurrectionem dicit Pisce oves meas super unum ædificat Ecclesiam. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus parem potestatem tribuat & dicat, sicut misit me Pater & Ego mitto vos, &c. tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erat utiq;

the beginning of it proceeds from Unity, that it might evidence the Church to be one. It's evident therefore that St Cyprian did not hereby intend to acknowledg St. Peter to be the Head of the rest of the Apostles, or that they derived their Authority from him, since he says, *That they had an equal Power and Authority given them by Christ*: His meaning then can be only this, that to evidence the necessity of Unity in the Church, our Saviour gave that Authority first to Peter single, which he afterwards gave to all together, to shew them that they ought in their several functions to aim all at the same thing, the Unity of his Church. He says indeed, that *Episcopacy is one*, but he adds what M. Meaux thought best for his purpose to leave out——*Whereof every one holds a part with full and ample Power.*

Cujus a singulis in solidum Pars tenetur Ibid.

He says likewise, *Adulterari non potest sponsa Christi, incorrupta est & Pudica*, but he does not say it for any such reason as this Gentleman pretends, lest we should imagine some cases might happen, in which it might be lawful to separate from the Church, or reform her Doctrine; as though it were impossible for a Church to fall into error, or to have need of being reformed. The coherence of the Discourse makes them bear a different meaning, viz. *That the true Spouse of Christ cannot admit this Unity to be interrupted, will not be corrupted to division.*

This Father further says, *That he that separates himself from the Church has no part in Christ's promises, &c.* We readily affirm the same of such as do it without a cause: But no advantage can be hence taken against us, 'till M. Meaux has first proved that the Church of Rome is this only true Church of Christ. He would have gained a great point indeed, if we were obliged to take it for granted that the Roman is this only true Church of Christ, and if the true Church was not to be sought and known by an examination of her Doctrines, and their consistency with the Faith. But he grossly abuses this good Father, when he would persuade us that St. Cyprian would not suffer men to enquire after the true Church, by examining her Doctrine, but to know her first, and then believe we cannot have salvation out of her. For so far as I can observe, he does not give the least intimation of any such thing in his Book, *De unitate Ecclesie*: And if he should, I see no reason that any have to subscribe to him, when indeed the Church being a Society professing the Faith of Christ, and subsisting for the maintenance of it, there can be no means of knowing which is that Church, but by knowing first the Faith of Christ, and also that this Church professes and holds the same. But I need not dispute about that for which he falsely pretends this Authority.

It's

It's true, in this Book, *De Unitate*, St. *Cyprian* only urges the Unity of the Church, and the Crime of those that break it; but there would be no reason to look upon his Arguments so strong, if the Church he defends had done any thing to the prejudice of the Faith: and therefore in other places he defends the cause of the Church in this case by the righteousness of it; by proofs from Scripture of the innocency and lawfulness of that which was imputed to her as a Crime. And therefore I must of all admire, that he could have the face to abuse those other words of St. *Cyprian*, in his Epistle to *Antonian*, to so false an intent, as if he had used them to forbid an enquiry after mens Doctrine, and to oblige us to submit to that which the Church holds without enquiry. Whereas not only the case St. *Cyprian* writes upon is utterly different, but even the method he takes in this very Epistle to satisfy *Antonian* and the connection of his Discourse, shew his sense to be as different from what M. *Meaux* would impose on us as possibly can be. For in the beginning of the Epistle he tells him, *That his careful and solicitous enquiry after the truth was not to be blamed, tho' he was in part blamable in that he wavered in the Resolution he had first taken and certified him and Cornelius of, that he would not communicate with Novatian.* After which he proceeds to give him an account of the cause of the Church, upon what account they admitted lapsed persons to the Communion, (which was charged as a crime on the Church by *Novatian*) relating the matter of fact, the reasons of it, and its consistency with Christian Discipline, proving it out of the holy Scriptures. Then he further gives account of the Election of *Cornelius* to the Bishoprick of *Rome*, of his Manners and Life, and purges him from the scandal his Adversaries had thrown upon him. And then indeed he says, *As for that which concerns the person of Novatian, since you desire to be informed what Heresie he has introduced, you must know before all things, that we need not curiously enquire what he has taught, since he hath taught out of the Church; who or what soever he be, he can be no Christian, being out of the Church of Christ.* But in the following words he gives the reason of it, because he had broke the Unity of the Church, by ambitiously aspiring to the Bishoprick, and getting himself made Bishop by some deserters, and to make a greater party, setting up several other false Bishops in those Provinces and Cities wherein were already seated Bishops of an approved Faith and tried Constancy. Whereupon he indeed says, *It was no matter whether Novatian introduced any Heresie or not, so long as he was the Author of so great a Schism.* Whereby it appears, that he is far from supposing what M. *Meaux* pretends, he only telling *Antonian*, *That it was no matter what Doctrine Novatian taught, because*

Epist. 51. ad
Anton.

because he had shewn himself unchristian, by breaking the Unity of the Church, and making a Schism without cause. So that the case supposed, is that of man breaking the Unity of the Church, be his Doctrine what it will, tho' the same which the Church teaches: not a case wherein the Church needs a Reformation and the adverse party has Truth and Scripture of his side; as it must have been to be applicable to the Church of Rome and the Reformed.

It's true St. Cyprian likewise says, *The promise of our blessed Saviour*, to be in the midst where two or three are gathered together, supposes them assembled in Christ, which he thinks they cannot be, whilst they are seperate from the Church of Christ: But this is begging the Question to use this against us, till it appears that the Church of Rome is the only True Church of Christ.

But M. Meaux says, *The Church of which this holy Martyr speaks*, is that which acknowledges at Rome the head of her Communion and in the Place of Peter the eminent degree of the Sacerdotal Chair, which there acknowledges the Chair of Peter and the Principal Church from which the Sacerdotal Unity hath taken its original, &c. Which any one that reads would think that St. Cyprian had said these things to distinguish that Church out of whose Communion there is no salvation: whereas they are only some scattered Expressions of his used upon quite different occasions, not in the least to mark out the Church, as this man pretends. He says not so far as I can find in any of the places cited, that the Church acknowledges at Rome the Head of her Communion. 'Tis true, in his Epistle to Antonian, speaking of Cornelius, he says, *That he was made Bishop when none was made before him, when the place of Fabian, i. e. the place of Peter and degree of the Sacerdotal Chair was void*: which as it was not spoken by him to distinguish the Church, so the utmost that can be made of it, is only that he look'd upon the Bishop of Rome as Successor to Peter. Neither are the words in the Epistle to Cornelius used to the purpose pretended, but occasionally only in writing to Cornelius about Fortunatus, who, being condemned and censured in his own Church, had recourse to Rome, which he calls, *the Chair of St. Peter, and Principal Church, where the Sacerdotal Unity hath its original*: yet in that very place he disowns all Authority of the Roman Bishop above his Brethren, and lets him know, *that every Pastor had a portion of the flock assigned him, which every one was to rule and govern, being to give account thereof to God*. Again, speaking of Cornelius in his Epistle to Antonian, he highly commends his constancy and courage, and lets him know how that he sat undaunted in the Sacerdotal Chair at that time, when the Emperor was so incensed against

Epist. ad Ant.
51.

Ad Corn. Epist.
54.

against the Christians and the Priests of God, that he could less endure a Bishop at Rome, than a Rival contending for the Empire. But he says not a word of that which M. Meaux slyly insinuates, the Emperor's taking on him the Title of *Pontifex Maximus*, as though the Roman Bishop was hateful to him only as he was his Rival in the Priesthood; as if the Christians had then acknowledged the Bishop of Rome to be the Chief Priest of the Christian World.

Epist. 51. ad Anton.

I am not concerned with those Objections he makes against the Ministry of the Reformists in France, there being no such prejudice to our Succession in England, and therefore may leave them to answer for themselves.

"The next thing he attempts, is to vindicate their Litanies, wherein they pray to the Virgin Mary, the Angels, St. Peter, &c. to pray for them, from tending to God's dishonour. But that a man may pray to these to pray for him, and yet come little short of Idolatry therein, if he sets no bounds to his desires, and considers not the infinite distance between God and his Creatures, has been shewn by me, p. 22. also that such Prayers, tho' the difference be observed, do notwithstanding tend to God's dishonour, being necessarily made upon a supposition that the Saints are endued with such qualities as are peculiar to God, and are not (so far as we know) communicated to them. For which reasons I do not wonder that M. Meaux is so willing to pass over this as a *captious Question*, Whether the Saints hear our Prayers, or no? For so long as this is a Question, and likewise so long as it is not revealed, that we should have recourse to these, but only to God, through one only Mediatour Christ Jesus, all their extenuations and shifts will never be able to clear this practice from tending to God's dishonour, and being injurious to Christ's mediatorship, since it supposes such perfections in the Creature, as are not revealed to us to be any where but in the Creator, and is also no other than an invention of our own, whereby we pretend to seek God by them that he has not directed us to approach him by.

But the reason upon which he calls this Question *Captious* is very inconsiderable, for if we should allow that the Holy Angels hear us and pray for us, I do not think it a Cavil to deny this (if true, which it is not) to be a proof, that the Saints do likewise hear us, unless he had shewn us where he learnt, what he so boldly asserts, That the Beatified Souls are united with the Angels in the same Illuminations. Besides, whilst he finds so great fault with others, for using the obscure parts of the *Apocalypse* against the Church of Rome, it's much he should make use of it himself, as if it were a clear proof of his unwarrantable assertion. The place cited, is

Rev.

Rev. 8. v. 3, 4, 5. where indeed there is an Angel represented with Incense, offering it with the Prayers of Saints, and the smoke of the Incense offered with the Prayers ascending up before God: But what ground is there from such a Representation, express in a Vision, very probably to prefigure the Devotions of Christians, whose Prayers are here represented, as coming up in remembrance before God, and being accepted of him as incense ascending out of the hand of the Priest; to infer either that the Angels do present our Prayers, or that they hear the Prayers men make to them to Pray for them, or to present their Devotions to God; when the Scripture has exprelly set forth unto us another High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the Throne, to appear in the presence of God for us?

Their Use of Images is the next thing he endeavors to defend, wherein he is very unwilling to enter into dispute and controverſie; and therefore laying aside those Questions that ought to have been resolved in the first place: *Whether the Church can command the use of Images in Religious Worship without warrant from the Word of God; whether it ought not now especially to lay aside a Practice which hath been experienced to bring in danger of Idolatry:* he sets his wits on work to find out Similies, and such like Shifts that he thought might give some plausible colour to these Actions. Whereupon first he asks us, "Whether we can believe an injury done to God in the kissing, as they do, the Book of the Gospel, and rising up to honour it, when it is carried in Ceremony before them, and bowing the Head before it? But now it cannot be said whether they do injure God thereby or not, without a perfect knowledge of their Practice, to which I am a Stranger; yet undoubtedly it may be abused to that Superstition, that God shall be dishonoured thereby, and let them resolve us whether they think it would not if Divine and Religious Worship were given to it?"

He further objects, "That we make no difficulty of swearing upon the Gospel, when at the same time it is not by the Ink and Paper, Letters and Characters that we swear, but by the eternal Verity which these things represent, which we look not upon as any derogation from God, and therefore should not account their use of Images such. To which I answer, First, That the Cases are very different; the one, though a solemn Action, yet not being any part of God's ordinary worship, as the other is. That secondly, Though an Oath be indeed a calling God to witness the Truth, yet we never find that he prescribed any Rules concerning, or forbid the use of any Ceremonies in it, but has
left

left it to the liberty of men to use it with what Ceremonies they please: That therefore this cannot be drawn into consequence where the case is not parallel. That again, it does not appear, that this custom of swearing upon the Gospel, did ever occasion that dishonour of God, that palpable Idolatry in some, and danger of it in others, which the use of Images in Religious worship has; that if it did appear, I should think it unlawful to be used any longer.

But to the pitiful evasion, *That an Image is but another manner of writing*; that therefore this Scripture of Images should be as venerable as that which is made upon Paper, Paper and Letters being the work of mens hands, as well as Sculpture and Painting; I shall only say this; That if such honour and worship were given to the Paper and Prints of the Bible, as they give to Images, I see no reason why it should not be thought highly offensive to God. Besides, he that shall look upon this as conclusive, that we may as well use these in Gods Service, as the writings of Scripture, might conclude by the same reason, that it was as lawful for the Jews to make Images, and set them up in their Temples for God's worship, as to use the Books of the Law and Prophets therein.

But why (says he) should you be more scrupulous of making your Prayers to Christ before an Image, than before a Pillar or a Wall? He might have forborn this Question, unless he had professed the case to be the same, that the Church of Rome matters not if we give no more respect to these than to the Wall or Pillar we kneel by; but this I believe he dares not affirm in Behalf of his Church.

He further tell us, *It is Superstition to fear that our Devotions should terminate in the Image, when we direct them to Christ.* Now I would willingly know what it would terminate in if Christ should refuse to accept it; and whether he can secure us that an intention to do this or that in honour to Christ, shall be accepted by him, though it be not what he directs us to for his honour, but an invention of our own? But what I most of all admire, is, that he should have the Face to call it *Superstition* for us to fear lest in honouring Images, we should have our hearts drawn from honouring Christ, and fix them upon these: he might as well have called it *Folly in God Almighty* to suffer Image-worship to be the provocation of his Jealousie; for if there be no reason for us to fear *its drawing off our hearts from God*, there can be none for God to be jealous of us upon that score.

There will be some reason for his limiting the Commandment that forbids to *make or bow down to Images*, only to the doing this in the Spirit of Pagans, believing them filled with a divine virtue

or that the Divinity is incorporated with them; when he shall shew, what he says he easily can, *That the Philosophers that bore above the common Error of Mankind, and declared that they did not worship the Image, but used them only to put them in mind of God, did indeed notwithstanding their Declaration to the contrary, put their trust in the Images themselves.* But till then, for the same Reasons that the Scriptures call the Pagans worshippers of *Stocks and Stones*, though they declared otherwise of themselves; we can account those of the Church of *Rome* but little better, whilst some of less understanding have been known to place a *Trust* and *Confidence* in the Images they use, and the more intelligent (tho' professing otherwise) *have relapsed into it in some kind, and confirmed the Impiety of the publick Worship, in adhering to, and commanding of it.* For it is but a pitiful shift to say that the abuse of this Practice among particular persons, if it be tolerated, yet it is not approved by the Church, since the Church continues to command that which has been the occasion of it. Wherefore though I dare not with *M. Meaux* pass so severe a censure, or pronounce any man *accursed of God*, yet I am sure he is more likely to be accursed of him, who defends a Practice that has been experienced to be the occasion of Idolatry, and labours notwithstanding to seduce men to it; than those who refuse submission to a Practice so manifestly destructive of God's true Worship, and make it their business to prevent others from the danger of such Snares.

As to their Ceremonies, which he seeks to defend by the use of some such in the Church of *England*, I have before observed, that it is the multitude of them that makes them so dangerous, because they are hereby apt to take up the greatest part of Religion, and draw men off from the spiritual Worship of God, and those that spend too great a Zeal upon them, will be apt to look upon them as all the Services they need pay to God, and thereupon neglect the principal Duties of Religion.

Whereas he will have it a Calumny on their Church, that they conceal the Mysteries of Religion from the People whilst they perform the Service of God in the *Latine* Tongue; that very Decree which he thinks to get off his Church by, does indeed make it the more culpable: For if it be necessary lest the little ones want Bread, that the Pastors explain to them some part of the Mysteries: This very Reason proves that the whole Service of God ought to be performed in the vulgar Tongue, that they may at all times and in all particulars understand and joyn in the Services of God, to his Honour, and their own growth and increase in Grace and Virtue.

But

But at length, he comes to the Doctrine of the *Sacrament*, and herein compares us to *Socinus*, and the Disciples of *Paulus Samosatenus*, "because we follow our humane Sense and Reason, and "are resolved to believe that Bread and Wine remain, because "they appear to our Senses. But before he had fixt this Charge upon us, he should have shewn us as clear a Revelation for the proof of their feigned *Transubstantiation*, as there is for *Christ's* being *God* as well as *Man*, and as clear a Command for us to worship the *Sacrament*, as there is for us to worship *Christ*, *God* and *Man*.

The difference betwixt the *Lutheran* Worship of *Christ* in the *Sacrament*, and that of the Adoration of the *Sacrament* itself, which is the *Roman* Doctrine, has been already stated. p. 87. For that the *Roman* Doctrine obliges to worship the *Sacrament*, not only *Christ* in the *Sacrament*, as *M. Meaux* would here insinuate, has been evidenced already from the Words of the *Trent-Council*, and that so the generality of their Authors understand it, we are sure from hence; That they confess this their Adoration would be *Idolatry*, if *Transubstantiation* were not true.

There is one peculiar Notion which *M. Meaux* has concerning the manner of the Efficacy of this *Sacrament*, to wit, That *Jesus Christ*, by uniting himself to our bodies, makes his *Grace* and his *Virtue* pass into our souls, supposing that his flesh taken in the *Sacrament* becomes incorporated with ours, which does both certainly vacate the necessity of our receiving this *Sacrament* more than once, unless it can be shewn how that flesh of his, which is once united to us should become disunited, and also makes it impossible to give a reason why the body of *Christ*, which, according to their Doctrine, is received by all alike, should not be alike effectual to all.

His Harangue about their being content to Communicate in one kind, may be easily turned upon him, by demanding, Ought you not to let us communicate according to our *Saviour's Institution*, as our *Saviour* communicated his *Disciples*, as the *Apostles* communicated the first *Christians*, as pious *Antiquity* communicated for several hundred years?

"But in that we own the Church of *Rome* to have been a true Church, and Salvation to be had in it, he presumes we are "thereby obliged to own, that this *Sacrament* is administered "to its full effect in that Church, tho' given only in one kind: however, tho' we should allow it to be the mark of a true Church, that it rightly Administers the *Sacraments*, yet there is no necessity that a defect herein must presently cause it to cease to be

a Church, tho' it will be indeed a corrupt one when the Ministry shall deprive the People of part of that Food that is necessary to Spiritual Life; perhaps therefore it may be allowed, that this Sacrament may be effectual in one kind to those that cannot obtain any more from the Church, and yet the Church herself, by thus depriving her Children of a part of this Sacrament, may lye under the guilt of withholding the necessary means of Salvation, and of voiding Christ's Institution, and it will be no thanks to the Church, if God, may out of the greatness of his mercy, supply the want by some extraordinary way of those means which the Church unjustly withholds from her Children.

But, says he, *You content your selves upon the Faith of the Church as to your Baptism, in that you are not then plunged and dipt under Water, which the Word Baptized doth properly signifie.* Whereas the Case is very different; for in that of *Baptism*, there is nothing thereby of the Essence of the Sacrament diminished, which depends only upon the washing with Water, not upon the quantity wherewith we are washed; however the *Rubrick* of the Church of *England* requires, that *where the Child is able to bear it, it be dipt under the Water*; whereas in the other a part that essentially constitutes the Sacrament is wholly taken away; for as to the quantity of Wine, there would certainly be no Contention.

These, as near as I could collect them, are all the material things in his Letter; the rest of it either concerns not us, or is only a Noise of Words made to amuse the Understandings, and work on the Fancies of weaker men. It is the usual way, 'tis true, for the *Romanists*, having neither Scripture nor Reason to alledge, to cant, and make a great Stir with high Words, such as *Catholick Church, Successor of Peter, Apostolick See, Principal Church, &c.* urging these as undeniable Proofs of their Churches Authority and Infallibility; whereas indeed they signifie nothing, though they have been prevalent with some beyond their true force. But since after so perfect a view of the utmost of all they can with any colourable pretence say for themselves, their Errors and Corruptions appear so great, none (I hope) will suffer themselves to be frightened into a Subjection to them, by those high Words, which, without the least reason they have the confidence to use and appropriate to themselves.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAg. 10. Lin. 30. dele *of*. p. 14 l. 13. r. *work*. p. 21. l. 12. r. *Eng-*
land. p. 24. l. 9. dele *so*. p. 75. l. 29. r. *joynd to*. p. 76. l. 3.
r. *Bond*. l. 20. r. *discerns*. p. 78. l. 32. r. *determino*. p. 81. l. 2. r.
reason of. p. 86. l. 1. dele *in*. l. 35. r. *do not*. p. 87. l. 16. r. *accord-*
ing to. p. 98. l. 25. r. *Who ever*.

T

BOOKS

BOOKS lately Printed for Robert
Kettlemell and Robert Wells at the Hand
and Scepter in Fleet-street.

1. **T**HE Measures of Christian Obedience: Or, A Discourse shewing what Obedience is indispensably necessary to a Regenerate State, and what Defects are consistent with it, for the Promotion of Piety, and the Peace of Troubled Consciences. By John Kettlemell, Vicar of Coles-Hill in Warwickshire, the second Edition. In Quarto, Price bound 8 s.

2. An Help and Exhortation to worthy Communicating: Or, A Treatise describing the Meaning, Worthy Reception, Duty and Benefits of the Holy Sacrament, and answering the Doubts of Conscience, and other Reasons, which most generally detain Men from it; together with Suitable Devotions added. By John Kettlemell, Vicar of Coles-Hill in Warwickshire. In Twelves, price bound 3 s.

3. A Discourse Explaining the Nature of Edification. Both of particular Persons in private Graces, and of the Church in Unity and Peace. And shewing that we must not break Unity and Publick Peace, for supposed Means of better Edifying in private Virtues. In a Visitation Sermon at Coventry, May 7. 1684. By John Kettlemell, Vicar of Coles-Hill in Warwickshire. In Quarto, price, price 6 d.

4. A Funeral Sermon for the Right Honourable, the Lady Frances Digby, who deceased at Coles-Hill in Warwickshire, on the 29 of Septemb. 1684. By John Kettlemell, Vicar of Coles-Hill in Warwickshire. In Quarto, price 6 d.

5. The Religious Loyalist: Or, A good Christian taught how to be a Faithful Servant both to God and the King. In a Visitation Sermon Preached at Coles-Hill in Warwickshire, Aug. 28. 1685. At At the Triennial Visitation of my Lord's Grace of Canterbury, during the Suspension of the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. By John Kettlemell, Vicar of Coles-Hill.

6. A Sermon Preached at Coles-Hill in Warwickshire, Jan. 24. 1685. On occasion of the Death of the Right Honourable Simon Lord Digby, Baron Digby of Geashil in Ireland, who deceased at Coles-

Coles-Hill, Jan. 19. 1685. On Heb. 6. 12. By John Kettlewell Minister of Coles-Hill in Warwickshire.

7. A Journey into Greece by Sir George Wheeler, in company of Dr. Sporn of Lyons, in six Books. Containing, 1. A Voyage from Venice to Constantinople. 2. An Account of Constantinople, and the adjacent Places. 3. A Voyage through the Lesser Asia. 4. A Voyage from Zant through several parts of Greece, to Athens. 5. An Account of Athens. 6. Several Journeys from Athens into Attica, Corinth, Bætia, &c. With Variety of Sculptures. In Folio, Price bound 15 s.

8. A Vindication of the Primitive Christians, in Point of Obedience to their Prince, against the Calumnies of a Book, entitled, The Life of Julian, written by Eusebius the Sophist. As also, The Doctrine of Passive Obedience cleared, in Defence of Dr. Hicks; Together with an Appendix being a more full and distinct Answer to Mr. Thomas Hunt's Preface and Postscript. Unto all which is added, The Life of Julian, enlarged. In Oct. price bound 3 s.

9. Two hundred Queries Moderately propounded, concerning the Doctrine of the Revolution of Humane Souls, and its Conformity to the Truths of Christianity. In Octavo, price bound 1 s. 6 d.

10. A Dissertation concerning the Pre-existency of Souls: Wherein the state of the Question is briefly unfolded, and divers Arguments and Objections on both sides alledged and answered; and a free Judgment concerning the Sum of the Controversie allowed to every one. Being Originally written in the Latine Tongue, several years since, by the Learned C. P. and now made English by D. F. D. P. upon the recommendation of F. M. H. their Friend. In Twelves, price 1 s.

11. The Paradoxical Discourses of F. M. Van Helmont, concerning the Macrocosm and Microcosm of the Greater and Lesser World, and their Union. Set down in Writing by J. B. and now published. In Octavo, price bound 3 s. 6 d.

12. A Spelling Book for Children. In Twenty fours, price bound 6 d.

13. Animadversions on Dr. Burnet's History of the Rights of Princes in the Disposing of Ecclesiastical Benefices and Church Lands. In a Letter to Friend. In Quarto, Price 3 d.

14. A Sermon Preached at the Worcester-Feast, by George Wallis Master of Arts, and Student of Christ-Church, Oxon. Quarto, price pitch 6 d.

15. The Treasures of the Sea; A Sermon preached to the Mariners, by William Thompson. In *Quarto*, price sticht 6 d.

16. A Sermon preached at the Church of St. *Bridget*, on Easter-day, being the first of April 1684. Before the Right Honourable Sir Henry Tulse Mayor of London. By Geo. Hicks D. D. Dean of Worcester, and Chaplain in ordinary of his Majesty. In *Quarto*, price sticht 6 d.

17. A good Subject: Or, The right Test of Religion and Loyalty. In a Sermon, preached July the 17th at the last Summer Assizes held at *Buckingham*, for the County of *Buckingham*. Before the Lord Chief Baron Mountague, and Sir Richard Hollo-way Knight, John Culling Esq; High Sheriff. By Lewis Aiterbury, D. D.

18. A Discourse on Persecution, or Suffering for Christs sake. Clearing the Notion of it; And making a Discrimination of *Just* from *Unjust Pretensions* to it. And passionately recommending *True Christian Suffering* to all those who shall be call'd thereto. Occasionally Representing the Folly and Sinfulness of Illegal, Arbitrary Courses for the Prevention of it, and the Security of our Church. By John Howel, A. M. Rector of Radnor Nova in the County of Radnor.
